00111681

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

MESSRS. CLARK have much pleasure in forwarding to their Subscribers the Second Issue for 1876,—

Professor GODET'S COMMENTARY ON ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL, Vol. First; and

Professor LUTHARDT'S ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL, described and explained according to its Peculiar Character, Vol. First.

The method of treatment is so different, that they do not think many will object to two Works on the Fourth Gospel by scholars so eminent.

They beg anew to thank the Subscribers for their support, and to respectfully request a continuance of it.

May they ask a remittance of the Subscription for 1877—21s.

The First Issue for 1877 will be GODET ON ST. JOHN, Vol. II.; DELITZSCH'S COMMENTARY ON THE SONG OF SOLOMON and on ECCLESIASTES (which will complete the Series of Old Testament Commentaries by Professors KEIL and DELITZSCH).

38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH,
December 1876.

CLARK'S

FOREIGN

THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

FOURTH SERIES.

VOL. LI.

Godet on the Gospel of St. John.

VOL. I.

EDINBURGH

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

1876.

PRINTED BY MURRAY AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, ... HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

DUBLIN, ... ROBERTSON AND CO.

NEW YORK, ... SCRIBNER, WELFORD, AND ARMSTRONG.

COMMENTARY

ON THE

GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN.

With a Critical Introduction.

TRANSLATED FROM THE SECOND FRENCH EDITION OF

F. GODET, D.D.,
PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, NEUCHATEL,

BY FRANCES CROMBIE AND M. D. CUSIN.

111681
ae

VOLUME FIRST.

B-C-30

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1876.

God
226.507
God/Com
111681

PREFATORY NOTE.

THE first part of this volume, containing the Introduction, pp. 1–300, has been translated by Mrs. Frances Crombie, but revised and carried through the press by myself. The translation of the remainder has been executed by Mrs. Cusin, one of the translators of Godet's *Commentary on St. Luke*, and revised by Rev. Alex. Cusin, M.A.

F. C.

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE,
ST. ANDREWS, *November* 1876.

DEDICATION OF THE COMMENTARY.

TO

M. CHARLES PRINCE,

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY, PROFESSOR OF PHILOLOGY IN THE COLLEGE OF NEUCHATEL.

MY DEAR FRIEND,—

MANY a time have we read and pondered together the holy pages whose exposition I now offer to the church. At each of those readings we have felt ourselves brought into more intimate acquaintance with Him whose life and sayings are traced by the historian. The work of the Holy Spirit as promised by Jesus: "*He shall glorify me,*" has been realized in our experience: Christ has been transfigured before our eyes.

After such joint study, in which your thought and mine have been so often fused into one, it would be impossible for me to distinguish in this work between *mine* and *thine.* And if I could do so, what purpose would it serve? On the way to Emmaus there is no speaking save of what is *His;* and, as in the case of the two travellers, the exclamation is: "*Did not our hearts burn within us while He talked with us by the way, and while He opened to us the Scriptures!*" Allow me at least, as I cannot quote you on every page, to associate your name with mine, when offering to the public this product of my pen, which is in so many respects the fruit of your lips.

Not, however, that I wish to render you responsible for the defects and faults which will certainly be found in this work, and to drag you with me before the tribunal of criticism. Your part extends no further than to the good and sound thoughts which may be found in these lines, to the heavenly gift received in common, which one of us transmits to the church.

May the studious youth of the churches of France and Switzerland, with a view to whom. I have chiefly laboured, discover, in reading this commentary, what I have so often experienced while studying the New Testament in your company: that theology has no more faithful friend, and no more reliable ally, than a vigorous and solid philology, which finds in the slightest shades of expression, at every word, the revelation of the substance of things.—Your friend,

THE AUTHOR.

NEUCHATEL, 1876.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE INTRODUCTION.

IN the first edition of this work, the critical study of the fourth Gospel was divided into two distinct dissertations: the one, placed as an introduction at the beginning of the book, treated of the historical testimonies; the other formed the conclusion of the commentary, and in it were discussed the questions of internal criticism which presupposed the detailed study of the sacred composition. The present state of the *Johannine question*, as it is now called, leads me to relinquish that plan, even although it does not cease to be, in my judgment, the true and rational course of procedure. The critical study of the Gospel of John has within the last thirty years assumed such proportions, and become of such decisive importance for theology and for the church, that it has grown to be, in itself alone, a subject for a treatise. The introduction and the conclusion of the first edition have therefore been blended into one whole in this volume, and at the same time entirely worked over anew. The volumes of exegesis which will follow, God willing, without delay, will be considerably abridged, since a large portion of what formed their contents, in the first edition, has passed into the present volume.

We do not doubt that those persons who have read the first edition, and who are willing to take note of this volume, will discover in it a marked progress, both in regard to an acquaintance with contemporary critical works, and with the intrinsic value of the argument.

It is little more than a quarter of a century since the question which was most largely discussed in the domain of sacred criticism was that of the origin of the church; the relation of St. Paul to the Twelve was a special object of study; and the writings of the New Testament which formed the principal subject of controversy, were the *Synoptic Gospels*, considered in their relation to the ecclesiastical parties of the primitive church, and *the Acts of the Apostles*. At the present day the struggle has drawn near to the centre. The point in question now is no longer concerning the church, but the person of its Head. This is the reason why the fourth Gospel has so rapidly gained the foremost place in critical consideration. This indication would suffice to prove the decisive importance of the crisis which is at present manifesting itself in the Christian Church. This is the moment for the believer to *hold fast his crown*, the divinity of his Saviour, and to clasp to his heart with a fresh love the document which contains the most positive pledges of that primary fact.

We do not allow ourselves to be intimidated by the tone of haughty assurance affected by the leaders of contemporary criticism. The contempt which some writers have sought to throw on our work has not prevented it from making its way, even in Germany, where the translation of a French commentary on the Gospel of John might seem a very superfluous undertaking. Whilst the French edition, a very large one, has, it is true, been exhausted only at the end of ten years, a second German edition has become necessary at the end of five. Founded upon the present work, it will appear almost simultaneously with it. The first English[1] edition, in like manner translated from this new work, will be published immediately. We have only indirectly learnt the existence of a Dutch translation, and we are ignorant of the nature of that publication. Why should we permit ourselves to be frightened by the scientific ostracism with which the organs

[1] The present translation.

of a self-styled liberal theology endeavour to smite everything which does not chime in with their songs of victory? Professor Scholten said in one of his latest works (*Der Apostel Johannes in Kleinasien*, p. 89): "That the fourth Gospel could not proceed from the Apostle John, is a result of historical criticism which is acknowledged with an ever greater unanimity by all whose vision is not obscured by some dogmatic prejudice."

Are those who thus speak quite certain of being themselves in their criticism exempt from every dogmatic prejudice, from all philosophical or theological preconceptions? How can we here avoid thinking of the warning which the Lord in the Sermon on the mount addressed to those who pretend to pull the mote out of the eye of their brother, whilst at the same time a beam is in their own?

A distinguished thinker, M. Charles Dollfuss, recently wrote the following lines with reference to the too ardent disciples of a scientific system which is in vogue at the present day (*Journal de Genève*, 18th July 1875, on Darwin's system): "This system has become for them a system armed with indisputable authority, a *Credo*. . . . What arrogant presumption! They have the sceptre in their hands; science is their kingdom. How far does the excommunication reach? . . . Those who still raise obstacles before the steps of the pontiffs, are obstructors of progress, people who cannot see, if not people struck with total blindness. We used to think, in good company, that the spirit of science and sectarianism were things diametrically opposite; we continue to think so, and we consider that the people of whom we speak cease to belong to science in exact proportion as they yield to intolerance." Could our theological situation be better described? As regards ourselves, we are firmly convinced that, with the erasure of the Johannine Gospel from the number of truly apostolic writings, a sensible obscuration would become apparent in the religious consciousness of mankind. And even if that consideration of moral utilitarianism

did not lead us to take up the defence of this unparalleled writing, we should be constrained to do so from a conviction of its authenticity, which every new study of it renders to our minds more irresistible.

We offer these pages to the Lord of the church, even while we feel them to be so little worthy of Him, and of the subject considered. We call to mind what He condescended to say of the offering of Mary: "She hath done what she could."

NEUCHATEL, *3d December* 1875.

PREFACE TO THE COMMENTARY.

I FEEL myself constrained, in publishing this commentary anew, to repeat the Dedication which accompanied the first edition. The words which I on that occasion addressed to the friend who since then has been removed from the scene of faith to that of sight, expressed, in a passing form, feelings which have never ceased to fill my heart. That Dedication will in particular apprize the studious youth of France and Switzerland how constantly they have been before my mind in the course of my former and my new studies, the fruit of which is offered to them in these pages.

In the preface to his *Bibelwerk*, addressed to the church, M. de Bunsen thus expresses himself: "If the Gospel of John is not the historical narrative of an eye-witness, but a myth, then we have no historical Christ, . . . and it is either a piece of the blindest superficiality or the bitterest irony to attempt to beguile us into the belief that a collective (*gemeindlich*) Christianity can still subsist on such a supposition" (p. x.).

The conditions on which a collective Christianity may exist differ, indeed, from those of individual Christianity. The individual may to a certain extent find spiritual life and moral health in faith in a Son of man who gradually ascends to heaven and becomes God. Such a believer is like the woman who touched the hem of Jesus' garment and obtained healing virtue by the touch.

But the creative power which produced the church, which has upheld it till now throughout the ages, and which guarantees its future existence and its final triumph—this cannot

proceed from attachment to a man who has become God; it emanates only from faith in the Son of God made man, faith in the Christ who, before ascending to God, came down from His presence as the perfect gift of His love. The Son of man deified is still man exalted. The Son of God made man is God glorified. And hence the bread "which came down from heaven" is also the only bread which "giveth life unto the world." Without faith in the *Word made flesh*, the church at the end of a few generations would be mute, and Christianity would share the lot of the forms which preceded it. This is the danger which more than ever threatens the world in our day.

In recent French publications I have sometimes met with statements from which it would follow that the Tübingen School, the great adversary of the fourth Gospel and champion of naturalism, was in a state of complete dissolution, and henceforth destitute of all influence. This, I fear, is an illusion. True, this School abandons the most advanced positions which it took up at first. It proceeds with more circumspection than at its first appearance. But by this moderation it has visibly extended its influence. And its action is so far from being exhausted at the present hour, that the traces of it are more and more to be found even among men who but lately showed themselves still independent of this powerful scientific current. The first phase of it is at an end. But that which is appearing will not be less formidable to the faith of the church and positive Christianity. The crisis through which the Christian world is passing has not reached its apogée.

I have sought in the first volume of this work, the Critical Introduction, to expound as clearly and fully and loyally as possible what is now called *the Johannine question*. And men who are conversant with the intricate studies of modern criticism, such as Professor Mangold, have not refused their testimony to my having written with a full knowledge of the question (*Theologische Litteraturzeitung*, 1876, No. 14).

But it is impossible nowadays to conceal from ourselves the fact,—the question of the *Johannine writing* is determined by another graver still: that of the *Johannine Christ*; and most frequently it is the latter which sways the solution of the former. Nothing can prevent the critic, whose inward feeling, for one reason or another, is repugnant to the Christ of John, from resolving the question of the fourth Gospel in a way conformed to the secret wish of his antipathy; as, on the other hand, the author, whose deepest and holiest aspirations are awakened on meeting with the figure of that same Christ, "full of grace and truth," will soon find in the lights proceeding from such profound sympathy the solution of critical difficulties which have been declared insurmountable.

When, on the one hand, we see Volkmar, that he may be able to place the composition of the Gospel of the Logos about 160, resolved to make its author the disciple of Justin (!),—and when, on the other hand, we see Keim, obliged by his testimonies and quotations to carry back the date of the composition to the first third of the second century, yet (that he may be able effectively to combat its authenticity, notwithstanding the date thrown back so early) going the length of denying that the Apostle John made any sojourn in Asia Minor at the end of the first century (!),—in view of those two facts, it is obvious that criticism, that would-be impartial and coldly objective science, is *capable of anything* to meet the secret wishes of the party pursuing it, because this is not abstract science, but a *man* too often governed by personal impressions and *à priori* principles which historical investigation does not touch nor modify, but which, on the contrary, hold the latter under their sway.

The study of the book itself may supplement in a way the weakness of critical discussion. The decisive influences which tell on the unprejudiced heart proceed most frequently from the Word itself. In this respect the commentator's task will consequently be to labour to scatter the mists which obscure

the clearness of the text, in order to facilitate that moral action which the book is capable of exercising over the reader by its own intrinsic virtue.

The only important exegetical works which we know on our Gospel since the publication of this commentary in 1863 and 1864, are Bäumlein's short treatise (1863), the author of which occasionally makes admirable use of his philological tact and erudition; the fifth edition of Meyer's excellent and indispensable commentary (1869), and the second edition of Luthardt's commentary, the last volume of which has just appeared (1876). Would that I could thank the second of those authors, the venerable Meyer, for the care with which he has referred throughout to my work. But he has entered on his rest, and my voice can no more reach him. I am the more happy to express to M. Luthardt my acknowledgments for the kindly attention which he has thought good to show me. What matters it that, in those exegetical discussions, differences are more conspicuous than agreements? This is inevitable. Those points are naturally passed over in silence in regard to which harmony is obtained.

The attentive reader who has studied the first edition of this commentary will easily appreciate the amount of labour which I have bestowed on its revision. Every page will furnish him with examples. More than ever do I feel the responsibility of expounding such a writing as that of John. This Gospel is the gem of the church, as its author was the gem of the apostolate. May this commentary not obscure too much the splendour of this unrivalled book! May it contribute in some little measure to make it shine with a livelier brilliance, to the glory of Him who was and who is the eternal brightness of the glory of God (2 Cor. iv. 6)!

NEUCHATEL, *November* 1876.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	Preliminary Considerations,	1
II.	History of the Discussions relating to the Authenticity,	8

BOOK I.

THE APOSTLE ST. JOHN.

I.	John in his Father's House,	29
II.	John in the Suite of Jesus,	31
III.	John at the Head of the Judæo-Christian Church,	36
IV.	John in Asia Minor,	41
V.	The Death of St. John,	61
VI.	Characteristics of John,	64

BOOK II.

ANALYSIS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

I.	Analysis,	67
II.	Characteristics of the Fourth Gospel,	84
	1. Historiographical Characteristics,	84
	A. The Facts,	96
	B. The Discourses,	134
	2. Theological Characteristics,	168
	3. Literary Characteristics,	188

BOOK III.

THE ORIGIN OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

I.	The Time of the Composition,	196
	1. Baur, 160 to 170,	197
	2. Volkmar, 155; Zeller and Scholten, 150; Hilgenfeld, 130 to 140; Keim, 130,	211
	3. Keim, 110 to 115; Nicolas, Weizsäcker, Renan, etc.,	227
	4. The Fathers, 80 to 100,	241
II.	The Author,	246
III.	The Place of Composition,	284
IV.	The Occasion and Aim of the Fourth Gospel,	286
V.	Summing up,	295
	Conclusion,	297

EXPOSITION.

PAGE

INTRODUCTION, ... 303

I. The different Conceptions of the Plan of the Gospel, . . 303
II. On the Preservation of the Text, ... 312
1. The Manuscripts, ... 312
2. The Old Versions, ... 316
3. The Fathers, ... 318
The Title of the Gospel, ... 323

THE PROLOGUE (Chap. i. 1–18), ... 326
First Section (Vv. 1–4—The Logos), ... 329
Second Section (Vv. 5–11—Unbelief), . . . 339
Third Section (Vv. 12–18—Faith), ... 352

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS ON THE PROLOGUE, ... 381
1. The Plan of the Prologue, ... 381
2. Intention of the Prologue, ... 382
3. The Idea and Term Logos, ... 386
4. The Truth and Importance of the Conception of the Person of Jesus expressed in the Prologue, ... 394

FIRST PART.

(I. 19–IV. 54.)

FIRST MANIFESTATIONS OF THE WORD—THE BIRTH OF FAITH—FIRST SYMPTOMS OF UNBELIEF, ... 405

FIRST CYCLE.

(I. 19–II. 11.)

FIRST SECTION.

The Testimonies of John the Baptist (i. 19–37), ... 406
First Testimony (vv. 19–28), ... 407
Second Testimony (vv. 29–34), ... 419
Third Testimony (vv. 35–37), ... 436

SECOND SECTION.

Beginnings of the Work of Jesus—Birth of Faith (i. 38–51), . 440
First Group (vv. 38–42), ... 441
Second Group (vv. 43–51), ... 447
The Son of Man, ... 457

INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS.

IN our first three canonical Gospels is comprised, in a triple form, the apostolic testimony by which the church was established. This testimony, reproduced by the evangelists day by day, in the bosom of the first Christian communities for the confirmation of believers, for the instruction of new disciples, and for the evangelization of non-Christian populations, soon assumed the settled forms, innumerable traces of which we find in the three writings in which it has been preserved to us. This is the teaching which in the Acts bears the name of the *doctrine of the apostles* (διδαχὴ τῶν ἀποστόλων), Acts xi. 42.[1]

The one amongst our three canonical redactions which bears the name of the *Gospel of Matthew*, reproduces that apostolic teaching under the form which it had assumed in Palestine, with a view to the *conversion of the Jews* to the gospel. The central idea which governed the testimony rendered to Jesus amid such surroundings, could only be that of His dignity as Messiah. Our first Gospel also, from the one end of its narrative to the other, brings prominently forward the relations between the prophecies of the Old Testament and the different circumstances in the history of Jesus. Its aim is to demonstrate the truth of that title of *Christ*, which the Judæo-Christian faith had definitely attached to the name of

[1] See my *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke.*

Jesus.[1] This redaction of the apostolic testimony, under the most primitive form, was undoubtedly published during the years which preceded the revolt of the people against the Romans, and decided their fate.[2] It was the final appeal addressed by Jehovah to His ancient people,—a last invitation to receive the Messiah, who alone might have prevented the impending catastrophe.

But, outside the Christian communities of Palestine, there already existed at that epoch, in the different countries of the empire, numerous churches, recruited for the greater part from the bosom of the pagan populations. In the eyes of these Christians of the Gentiles, the *Messianic* dignity of Jesus had not the same importance which it had from a Jewish point of view. The argument drawn from the prophecies was decisive only amongst those whose minds were familiarized with the ancient oracles through the weekly reading of the Old Testament. The great means of conversion to Christianity amongst pagan populations was the proclamation of Jesus as the Saviour of humanity. The work of redemption wrought out by Him in favour of all men, and offered gratuitously and without the condition of works of the law to the faith of each individual: such was, in this new medium, the power by which the gospel laid hold of hearts. The Epistles of the Apostle of the Gentiles truly prove that in that was contained the dominant thought of evangelization in the heart of the pagan world. And it is precisely this which forms the characteristic feature in the narrative of St. Luke. Our third Gospel, with its complement the book of the Acts, undoubtedly forms, then, that monument of the gospel teaching by which Paul and his fellow-labourers founded the churches of the Gentiles.[3] We have, therefore, still at the present day, before our eyes, in the first and third of our canonical Gospels, the

[1] Matt. i. 1: "Genealogy of *Jesus Christ*;" compare this beginning with the last words of the book, xxviii. 18-20, where Jesus proclaims the complete realization in His own person of the Messianic programme contained in that designation.

[2] Matt. xxiv. 15, the church is expressly put on her guard against any participation in the revolts which are to lead to the ruin of Jerusalem and of the Jewish State.

[3] Luke i. 4: "Those things wherein thou hast been [literally] *catechetically instructed*."

apostolic testimony under its two elementary and primordial forms; in the one, this testimony in so far as adapted to the wants of the Jewish nation; in the other, this same testimony fitted to the instruction of heathen populations.

A third form, intermediate between the two preceding, was possible. Certain churches among the Gentiles might be desirous of possessing the primitive Palestinian teaching, the simple and picturesque tableau of the ministry of evangelization accomplished by Jesus in Israel. Had not that teaching been the point of departure of the new preaching which at that time was already resounding throughout the whole world, which had reached even to Rome, and was manifesting itself as an important historical fact?

To satisfy that desire, what was necessary? To cut off from the catechetical instruction of the apostles the prophetic comparisons, and grand discourses which Jesus had pronounced in special relation to the Jewish law; next to introduce into this narrative, destined for those who had been formerly heathens, the necessary explanations relating to Jewish customs. These are precisely the characteristics of our second Gospel. Its author, Mark, a native of Palestine, had himself been nourished on that primitive teaching intended for the Jews. He had afterwards accompanied in their missionary journeys Paul, then Barnabas, finally Peter himself. It is natural, therefore, that we should find in his writings the primitive catechetical instruction which forms the substance of Matthew; but disentangled from all exclusively Jewish elements, and reanimated by the insertion of numerous features of detail, evidently due to the personal reminiscences of an eye-witness to whose narratives Mark had often listened. Our second Gospel is accordingly the Palestinian tradition freshened up in passing by the lively recollection of a witness, and drawn up with a view to some community situated in the Gentile world.[1]

The character common to these three forms, and which constitutes them three branches, as it were, of the same trunk, is their dependence, more or less exclusive, upon the apostolic

[1] See upon that relation between our first three Gospels, the fine exposition of Thiersch in *Versuch zur Herstellung des Historischen Standpuncts für die Kritik der Neutest. Schriften*, 1845, pp. 132–136.

tradition. To this fundamental feature is attached the second character which unites them; viz., their elementary and catechetical nature. The primitive preaching, whether addressing itself to men who were still strangers to the faith, or to new disciples whose instruction had still to be carried on, must naturally be clothed with that character which was afterwards transmitted to the writings in which it became fixed.

And here is the place to inquire whether the teaching imparted by Jesus to His disciples could have entered in all its entirety into the primordial framework of Jewish or pagan evangelization. In the course of His private or public ministry, in His solemn testimonies delivered in the presence of the Jewish people and their rulers, in His confidential interviews with His apostles,—must Jesus have uttered only words fitted to instruct Jewish or pagan populations? Would He not have risen, in certain decisive circumstances, in certain moments of outpouring of soul, to a height which surpassed such a level, and where His select auditors alone could follow Him? Could His teaching have nourished the ages, if it had remained enclosed within limits so narrow? Weizsäcker, whose admirable pages we shall often quote, whilst occasionally opposing his views, expresses himself thus on the point before us: "We understand very well how, in the first ages, tradition should be occupied with the redaction of certain words of wisdom which proceeded from the lips of Jesus. They had, alongside of these features of detail, the total and concrete impression of His person. The oral testimony rendered to Jesus was thus found on the same height as the revelation which He had given of Himself. But, with time, there must have been perceived a chasm, and an effort made to reproduce more completely, for those who came afterwards, that which Jesus had been for His immediate witnesses, by the manifestation of His whole life. Here was the final task of the evangelical narrative, the crowning point of the composition of the Gospels. This work no doubt responded to the wants of a more advanced age, but it could also issue only from the treasury of the most personal apostolic experience."[1] How, indeed, should not one of the direct witnesses of the ministry of Jesus, plunging back into his immediate

[1] *Untersuchungen über die evangel. Geschichte*, p. 288.

recollections, have found in them materials which surpassed all that could have found its way into the primitive apostolic testimony? We already discover in Mark's narrative a multitude of little picturesque details which were wanting in the ordinary tradition, and which found their way into the written narrative only through the personal reminiscences of an apostle. We find in Luke a still more considerable enlargement of the Palestinian tradition, whether as regards the limits of the ministry of Jesus, or the particular materials of which His history was composed.[1] Could not a witness, who approached still nearer to the primary source in drawing from the depth of his recollections, make treasures spring forth from them which had not entered into the channel of the first gospel teaching? Matthew had demonstrated the Messianic *function* of Jesus; Mark had described His *activity* as an evangelist in Israel; Luke had presented His *work* as Saviour in respect to the world. But, behind His function, His activity, His work, there was His *person* itself. Here is the background of all the peculiar mysteries of that life; and of that central mystery, should Jesus never have said anything to His own friends? Should He not have made them understand of *what nature* that being was who here below fulfilled this threefold commission of Messiah, celestial evangelist, and Saviour of men? Assuredly, when once the church was established, and the work of the first gospel teaching accomplished, all that part of the personal teaching of Christ which this task had not immediately absorbed could not fail to come to light, by the mouth and by the pen of one of His own followers, of one of the most intimate amongst His friends.

No one will deny the possibility—the probability even—of a supposition of this kind. The question is, whether we are to regard our fourth canonical Gospel as the realization of this hypothesis. This is the question which properly forms the subject of this work.

The objection may undoubtedly be raised, that the teaching of Jesus Christ, forming an organic and indivisible whole, cannot, even for one moment, be divided. It is consequently

[1] See the demonstration of this fact in the excellent work of M. Sabatier, *Essai sur les sources de la vie de Jésus.*

an inadmissible supposition that certain elements of that teaching were neglected at the outset, in order to form afterwards the subject of a degree of higher instruction.

This objection rests on a twofold misunderstanding. It changes, first, into a procedure based upon reflection, what was the simple result of educational convenience and accommodation to missionary purposes? Did not Jesus Himself, in His intercourse with His apostles, relegate to the future the teaching of things which *as yet they could not bear?* The work of the apostles was of quite a practical nature. They thus delivered, in their first instructions, only what might aid in the conversion of men, and what their new disciples *could bear.* There was not in this any mechanical and quantitative picking and selecting. It is the natural method of the gardener, who gives to each flower only that amount of water which it can organically appropriate to itself.

Further, the sublime idea of the person of the Saviour, which forms the salient feature of the fourth Gospel, does not belong exclusively to that writing. It is implied, as we shall see, in the first three Gospels. Nay, more; it lies at the foundation of the feeling of the whole primitive church. It is with the gesture of adoration that the whole apostolic church, Jewish and heathen, regarded its head. The fact is *established* for the Gentile churches by the Epistles of St. Paul, in which the invocation of Jesus is a fact supposed to be admitted by all readers. The same sentiment is expressed in all the documents of the Jewish-Christian faith. The title by which believers are there designated—*Those who call on the name of the Lord*—sufficiently demonstrates it.[1] For it is only a reproduction of that by which the Old Testament designated the worshippers of Jehovah. In this formula, the name of Jesus is simply substituted for that of God. Now, let us recall the austerity of the Israelitish Monotheism; of that Monotheism with which the apostles and the first believers were imbued from their cradle, and the merciless severity of which was the reason of the condemnation of Jesus by the Sanhedrim; let us reflect on the almost insur-

[1] Acts ii. 21, compared with iv. 10 and 12 (the discourse of Peter); ix. 14 (the discourse of Ananias); Jas. ii. 7, compare again Heb. i.; Apoc. v. 13, 14, compare with xxii. 8, 9.

mountable moral difficulty which must have been therein contained for men, brought up under the empire of such a principle, to recognise as worthy of being invoked and adored, a being with whom they had familiarly lived, travelled, eaten, and drunk, and whom they had seen die: and we will feel that the Israelitish believers never could have risen to such a faith if there had not issued from the lips of Jesus Himself precise declarations on this point, such as those which are presented to us by the fourth Gospel. That writing, then, is a necessary postulate of the history of primitive Christianity.

Nevertheless, its authenticity is contested at the present time more than ever; it is even denied with a singular assurance. It is important, before entering on the examination of the question, to cast a glance on the phases of the controversy down to the present time.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE DISCUSSIONS RELATING TO THE AUTHENTICITY.

IN the rapid review which is to follow, we might bring together in a single series, determined by chronological order, all the writings upon the subject before us, whatever be the tendency to which they belong. But it seems preferable to us, with a view to clearness, to distribute the authors whom we intend to quote into three series chronologically parallel: 1st, The advocates of the entire spuriousness of our Gospel; 2d, The defenders of its absolute authenticity; 3d, The supporters of the different middle terms proposed.[1]

I. Down to the end of the seventeenth century, the question had not even been raised. It was known that in the primitive church, a small sect, mentioned by Irenæus and Epiphanius, attributed the fourth Gospel to Cerinthus, an adversary of the Apostle John at Ephesus. But the learning of theologians, as well as the feeling of the church, ratified the almost unanimous decision of the first Christian communities, and of their leaders, who saw in it the work of St. John.

Some attacks of little importance, proceeding from the side of the English Deists, who flourished two centuries ago, commenced the struggle. But it did not burst forth seriously till a century later. In 1792, the English theologian Evanson raised for the first time some noteworthy objections against the general belief.[2] He took his stand especially on the differences between our Gospel and the Apocalypse. He attributed the composition of the former of these books to some Platonic philosopher of the second century.

The discussion was not long in being transplanted into

[1] We nevertheless warn the reader that this division cannot be strictly maintained, so varied are the different points of view.

[2] *The Dissonance of the Four generally received Evangelists.*

Germany. Six years after Evanson, Eckermann[1] controverted the authenticity, whilst allowing that certain Johannine traditions must have formed the first foundation of our Gospel. Several German theologians carried on the attack thus begun.[2] They urged the contradictions with the first three Gospels, the exaggerated character of the miracles, the metaphysical tone of its discourses, the manifest theological relations between the theology of its author and that of Philo, the scarcity of literary traces establishing the existence of that writing in the second century. From 1801, the cause of the authenticity seemed to be already compromised to such a degree that a German Superintendent, Vogel, allowed himself to cite the Apostle John and his interpreters to the bar of the last judgment.[3] This, however, was still only the first phase of the struggle, the time of skirmishes which generally preludes that of pitched battles.

It was again a German Superintendent who opened the second period of the controversy. Bretschneider, in his *Probabilia*, published in 1820, concentrated in one vigorous attack all the objections which had been previously raised, and to these added new ones.[4] He developed with much force the objection drawn from the contradictions with the first three Gospels, whether from the point of view of the form of the discourses, or from that of the Christological teaching. The fourth Gospel must be the work of a Christian of pagan, probably Alexandrian, origin, who lived during the first half of the second century. The learned and skilful work of Bretschneider called forth numerous replies, of which we shall speak further on; and at the close of which this theologian declared, in 1824, that he had attained the end he had proposed to himself, viz., that of calling forth a more vigorous demonstration of the authenticity of the fourth Gospel.[5] But the seeds sown by the hand of Bretschneider were not eradicated from the soil by this somewhat equivocal retractation. De Wette, in his *Introduction*, published for the first time in

[1] *Theologische Beiträge.*

[2] Schmidt, Cludius, Ballenstädt, Horst.

[3] *Der Evangelist Johannes und seine Ausleger vor dem jüngsten Gericht.*

[4] *Probabilia de evangelii et epistolarum Johannis apostoli indole et origine.*

[5] In Tzschirner's *Magazin für christliche Prediger.*

1826, without positively taking part against the authenticity, confessed the impossibility of demonstrating it in an unanswerable manner. In the same year, Reuterdahl, following in the footsteps of Vogel, assailed as a forgery the tradition of the sojourn of John in Asia Minor.[1]

The publication of the *Life of Jesus* by Strauss, in 1835, exercised a much more decisive influence upon the criticism of the history of Jesus than upon that of the *documents* in which that history has been transmitted to us. Strauss evidently had not devoted himself to a special study of the origin of these latter. He set out, as regards the Synoptics,[2] from two ideas which had been disseminated before him,—the theories of Gieseler and of Griesbach, according to which our Gospels are a redaction of the apostolic tradition, which, after having circulated for a long time in a purely oral form, was at last slowly fixed in our Synoptics (Gieseler); this at first in the redactions of Matthew and of Luke; then in that of Mark, which is only a compilation of the two others (Griesbach). As for John, he admits as proved the conclusions of Bretschneider. And if in his third edition, in 1838, he recognised that the authenticity of that Gospel was no longer so absolutely unmaintainable in his eyes, he was not long in retracting that concession in the following edition in 1840. In reality, the slightest tergiversation upon this point unsettled the whole of his edifice of mythical legends. The axiom which forms its basis, that the ideal is not exhausted in one individual, would be demonstrated to be false if the fourth Gospel were the narrative of an eye-witness. Nevertheless, the great excitement produced in the learned world by the work of Strauss could not fail soon to react upon the criticism of the Gospels.

Christian Hermann Weisse was the individual who first drew attention, in a remarkable work, to the close connection between the criticism of the history of Jesus and that of the Gospels. From 1838, he studied in a special manner the nature and origin of these writings.[3] He positively rejected

[1] In his work, *De Fontibus historiæ Eusebianæ.*

[2] Name given to our first three Gospels, on account of the parallelism of their contents.

[3] *Die Evangelische Geschichte kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet*, 1838. *Die Evangelien-Frage*, 1856.

the authenticity of the fourth Gospel, but not without recognising in that book an apostolic foundation. The Apostle John, with the view of fixing the image of his Master, which, in proportion as the reality receded from his view, became more and more indistinct in his mind, and in order to render to himself a clear account of the impression which he had preserved of Jesus, had drawn up certain "studies," which, when enlarged, became the discourses of the fourth Gospel. To these portions, more or less authentic, there was adapted at a later time an historical framework altogether fictitious. It is not impossible to comprehend how, from this point of view, Weisse could defend the authenticity of the first Epistle of John. At this moment there appeared in the criticism of our Gospel a revolution similar to that which was taking place at the same time in the manner of regarding the first three Gospels. Wilke was endeavouring at that very time to prove that the differences which distinguish the synoptic narratives from one another were not, as had always been believed, simple and involuntary accidents; but that it was necessary to recognise in them modifications, introduced in a manner savouring of reflection and of deliberate purpose, by each author into his own narrative or that of his predecessors.[1] Bruno Bauer extended this method of explanation to the fourth Gospel.[2] He maintained that the Johannine narrative was not at all, as the treatment of it by Strauss supposed, altogether the simple deposit of a legendary tradition; but that this narrative was the reflective work of a thinker and of a poet conscious of his procedure—the product of an individual conception. The history of Jesus thus became a philosophical and poetical romance; which, according to the witty expression of Ebrard, who reduced the narrative of it to a single line: "At that time it came to pass . . . that nothing came to pass."

In that same year Lützelberger attacked, in a more decided and thorough manner than Reuterdahl, the tradition of the sojourn of John in Asia Minor.[3] The author of our

[1] *Der Urevangelist*, 1838.

[2] *Kritik der evangel. Geschichte des Johannes*, 1840.

[3] *Die Kirkliche Tradition über den Apostel Johannes und seine Schriften in ihrer Grundlosigkeit nachgewiesen.*

Gospel, according to him, was a Samaritan, whose parents had emigrated to Mesopotamia, between 130 and 135, at the time of the new Jewish revolt against the Romans, and had composed that Gospel at Edessa. That "disciple whom Jesus loved," whom the author is pleased to bring upon the stage, was not John, but Andrew.

We here reach the third and last period of this prolonged controversy. It dates from 1844, and has for its point of departure the famous work published at that date by Ferdinand Christian Baur.[1] The first phase had lasted upwards of twenty years, from Evanson to Bretschneider (1792–1820); the second, in like manner, twenty and odd years, from Bretschneider to Baur; the third has now lasted more than thirty years. It is that of the struggle to extremity. The dissertation which gave the signal to it is certainly one of the most ingenious and brilliant compositions which theological science has ever produced. The purely negative results of the criticism of Strauss demanded for their complement a positive construction; on the other side, the arbitrary and subjective character of the procedure of Bruno Bauer did not respond to the wants of an age eager for positive facts. The discussion found itself then enclosed, as it were, in an inextricable difficulty. Baur understood that his task was to withdraw it from that position, and that the only efficacious means for that purpose was to discover in the progress of the church of the second century a clearly defined historical situation, which might present itself as the soil on which there could have been raised an edifice so grand as that of the fourth Gospel. He believed that he had discovered that situation towards the middle of the second half of the second century. *Gnosticism* was then flourishing, alongside of which our Gospel marches throughout its entire course. At that time thoughtful men were above all preoccupied with the idea of the *Logos*, which is precisely the theme of our work. The need was then making itself more and more felt of uniting in one great and single catholic

[1] In Zeller's *Theologische Jahrbücher*, Numbers 1, 3, and 4, reproduced and completed in the later writings of the same author: *Kritische Untersuchungen über die canonischen Evangelien*, 1847; and *Das Christenthum u. die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, 1853.

church the two parties, hostile to each other, of which the primitive church was composed, but which a series of numerous transactions had gradually drawn closer together. The fourth Gospel appeared as the desired treaty of peace. The spiritualistic reaction of Montanism was at that time displaying itself against the Episcopate. Our Gospel supports this tendency, by borrowing from it whatever it contains of truth. Finally, there was then kindling up the discussion between the churches of Asia Minor and those of the West on the Paschal rite. Now it seemed evident to Baur that our Gospel modifies the history of the Passion in such a manner as to draw away minds toward the Western rite. While thus placing in a determinate historical situation the composition of our Gospel, Baur, following in the footsteps of Bruno Bauer, demonstrates with wonderful skill the reflective and systematic unity of that work; he explains its logical march and its practical applications, and thus destroys at a single blow both the hypothesis of unreflective myths, on which rested the work of Strauss, and every attempt at selecting between certain authentic and other non-authentic parts in our Gospel. Baur admits, then, the unity and the integrity of the writing, and fixes as the date of composition about the year 170, when all the circumstances indicated above meet together. He has not attempted, however, to designate "the great unknown," to whose pen we owe this masterpiece of high mystical philosophy and skilful ecclesiastical policy which has exercised so decisive an influence over the destinies of Christianity. From that moment the discussion had a precise object. All the forces of the school agreed in supporting the work of the master in its different parts. Zeller completed it by the study of the Ecclesiastical testimonies; and that labour had as its result the sweeping away from the history of every trace of the existence of the fourth Gospel before the epoch indicated by Baur.[1] Schwegler, in his treatise on the period which followed that of the apostles, assigned to each one of the writings of the New Testament its place in the development of the struggle between the apostolic Judæo-Christianity and Paulinism, and

[1] *Die äusseren Zeugnisse über das Dasein und den Ursprung des vierten Evangeliums*, in the *Theol. Jahrbücher*, 1845 and 1847.

presented the fourth Gospel as the final and rich product of that long elaboration of the primitive Christian thought.[1] Köstlin, in a famous work on the *pseudonymous literature* in the primitive church, endeavoured to prove that the pseudographic procedure, to which Baur attributed the composition of four-fifths of the New Testament, was in conformity with literary precedents and the ideas of the epoch.[2] Volkmar laboured to ward off the blows with which the system of the master had been incessantly threatened by the quotations, less and less indisputable, of the fourth Gospel in the writings of the second century, those of Marcion and of Justin, for instance, and the *Clementine Homilies*.[3] Hilgenfeld finally treated, in a more profound manner than Baur had done, the dispute about the Passover, and its relation to the authenticity of our Gospel.[4] Thus learnedly supported by that Pleiad of distinguished critics, devoted not without marked variations to the common cause, the opinion of Baur might appear for the moment to have gained a complete and definite triumph. Nevertheless, in the bosom of the school itself there was already manifesting itself a divergence of a secondary nature doubtless, but which, nevertheless, in many respects, struck a blow at the hypothesis so skilfully designed by the master. Hilgenfeld abandoned the date fixed by Baur, and in consequence the advantages of the situation chosen by him; he removed the composition of John's Gospel backward from thirty to forty years. According to him, the origin of that writing was connected with the development of Gnosticism, especially of the *Valentinian* heresy. According to his own expression, he hoped "to succeed in throwing light, by the torch of Gnosticism, upon the sanctuary of Johannine theology." The author of the Gospel had proposed to himself to cause the Gnostic teaching to penetrate into the church under a modified form. Already towards 150, "the existence of that writing could scarcely

[1] *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter*, 1846.

[2] *Ueber die pseudonymische Litteratur in der ältesten Kirche*, in the *Theol. Jahrbücher*, 1851.

[3] Compare, in particular, *Ursprung unsrer Evangelien*, 1866; that work is a violent indictment against that of Tischendorf: *When were our Gospels composed?*

[4] *Der Passahstreit der alten Kirche*, 1860.

be any longer called in question. It must then date from 130 to 140.[1]

Volkmar took an intermediate position. He spoke of the year 155; and the Dutch professor, Scholten, in a work published in 1864, likewise removed back the date of the composition as far as 150. The author was, according to him, a Christian of pagan origin, initiated in Gnosticism, and who had taken it as his task to render that tendency profitable to the church. It contained at the same time, within wise limits, the Antinomian reaction of Marcion, and the exaltation of the Montanist spiritualism, which were at that time displaying themselves. He interposed, finally, in the question of the Passover; not to decide in favour of the Western usage, as Baur thought, but to ensure the triumph of the principle of Pauline spiritualism, according to which there ought no longer to be any festival days in the church. The author of the fourth Gospel then skilfully appropriated the truth contained in all the tendencies of that epoch (the middle of the second century); and without sliding into any of their exaggerations, he presented to the world, under the figure of a purely ideal disciple of him whom Jesus loved, the perfect spiritual Christianity which alone could become the universal religion.[2]

In 1866, this same point of view was developed by M. Réville in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*.[3] M. d'Eichthal in like manner expressed his assent to the idea of a relationship between our Gospel and Gnosticism.[4] The work which M. Stap published the same year, in his collection of critical studies,[5] is only a reproduction without originality of all the ideas of the school of Tübingen. These first retrograde steps in the date of our Gospel were followed by a third, still more considerable.

In 1865, appeared the *History of Jesus*, by Keim.[6] He energetically opposes, in the part of the introduction which

[1] See *Das Evangelium u. die Briefe Johannis nach ihrem Lehrbegriffe dargestellt*, 1849; *die Evangelien*, 1854; *das Urchristenthum*, 1855.

[2] *Das Evang. nach Johannes*, 1864, translated into German by H. Lang, 1867.

[3] Livraison de Mai.

[4] *The Gospels*, 1863, Book I. p. 25 and foll. and elsewhere.

[5] *Historical and Critical Studies on the Origin of Christianity.*

[6] *Gesch. Jesu von Nazara.*

he devotes to the study of the sources, the authenticity of the fourth Gospel. He takes his stand especially on the philosophical character of that writing, and upon the contradictions which the narrative contains, with the nature of things, with the data furnished by the writings of St. Paul, and with the synoptic narratives. But, on the other hand, he establishes the traces of the existence of that work as far back as the most remote times of the second century. "The testimonies," he says, "go back even to the year 120; so that the composition dates from the beginning of the second century, in the reign of Trajan, between 100 and 117."[1] The author was a Christian of Jewish origin, belonging to the *Diaspora* of Asia Minor, in perfect sympathy with the heathen, and thoroughly acquainted with all that concerns Palestine. In a more recent writing, a popular reproduction of his great work, Keim has gone back from that early date, assigning as his reason for the change of opinion, arguments which, we may say, contain nothing serious; he now fixes its composition in the year 130.[2]

Of what importance here is a decade of years? It would follow from the one as well as from the other of these latter dates, that twenty or thirty years after the death of John at Ephesus, the fourth Gospel was attributed to him by the very presbyters of the country where he had spent the end of his life, and where he had died. How can we explain the success of an act of falsehood in such circumstances? Keim felt that difficulty; and in order to remove it, he found no other means than to take up the idea let fall by Reuterdahl and Lützelberger, and to represent the alleged sojourn of John in Asia Minor as a mere fable. By this decided step he went beyond the school of Tübingen. Baur and Hilgenfeld did not doubt for an instant the truth of that tradition. Their criticism even rests essentially on the reality of that fact; at first, because the Apocalypse, the Johannine composition of which serves them as a lever for overturning that of the Gospel, demands the sojourn of John in Asia; and afterwards, because all their reasoning, drawn from the alleged

[1] Vol. i. p. 146. [Eng. transl. vol. i. p. 196.]

[2] *Gesch. Jesu, nach den Ergebinssen heutiger Wissenschaft, für weitere Kreise*, 3d edition, 1873.

contradiction between the Paschal tradition, bequeathed by the apostle to the churches of Asia, and the day of Jesus' death in the fourth Gospel, would fall to the ground with the sojourn of John in these countries. At the present day, on the contrary, since the criticism which is hostile to our Gospel feels itself embarrassed by this sojourn, it throws it overboard without ceremony. According to Keim, all that tradition is only the result of a misunderstanding of Irenæus, who applied to John the apostle what Polycarp had related before him of quite a different person. Scholten then came to the rescue, in a special work,[1] but with an important difference. That false tradition is to be explained, according to him, by a confusion of another kind. In the church, the author of the Apocalypse, who was not the Apostle John, but who had borrowed his name, was taken for the apostle himself, and in this way they had come to suppose that John must have lived in Asia, where the Apocalypse seems to have been composed. Whatever be the real state of the case, and however the error retailed by the tradition is to be accounted for, the discovery of that error "takes away," as Keim says, "the last point of support to the idea of the composition of the Gospel by the son of Zebedee" (p. 167). [Eng. trans. vol. i. p. 222.] In this way two of the bases of Baur's criticism—the authenticity of the Apocalypse, and the sojourn of John in Asia—are at this hour undermined by those very men who continued his work, because such a negation appears to them the only means of making an end of the sacred book.

In 1868, the Englishman Davidson ranked himself amongst the opponents of the authenticity.[2] Holtzmann, like Keim, sees in our Gospel an ideal composition, but nevertheless one not entirely fictitious, dating from the epoch of the Epistle of Barnabas (the first third of the second century), and which since 150 has been favourably welcomed by the church.[3] Krenkel, in 1871, defended the sojourn of the apostle in Asia; he attributed to him the composition of the Apocalypse, but not that of the Gospel.[4]

[1] *Der Apostel Johannes in Klein Asien*, translated by Spiegel, 1872.
[2] *Introduction to the Study of the New Test.*, vol. ii.
[3] Schenkel's *Bibellexicon*, vol. ii., art. "Evang. nach Joh.," 1869.
[4] *Der Apostel Johannes*, 1871.

We close our review by mentioning a work, published this very year, in which is summed up with immense erudition all the critical labour of past times and of the present epoch. It is Hilgenfeld's *Introduction*[1] *to the New Testament.* In that work the author continues to defend the cause to which he consecrated the first-fruits of his pen,—viz. the composition of the Gospel of John under the influence of the Gnosticism of Valentinus.

II. This persevering attack by one party of modern critics against the authenticity of the fourth Gospel, resembles the siege of a fortress on which depends the fate of a country. In face of all these onsets, the defenders, let it be understood, did not remain inactive,—they also felt the supreme importance of that scientific struggle; and the numerous transformations which the tactics of their opponents underwent, sufficiently demonstrate the continuous action exerted upon the assailants by the works of defence. We shall rapidly enumerate the writings published in favour of the authenticity.

The oldest attack — that of the sectaries of the second century, called *Alogi*—did not remain unanswered; for it seems certain that the work of *Hippolytus* (beginning of the third century), the title of which thus appears in the catalogue of his works,[2] *In favour of the Gospel of John and of the Apocalypse,*[3] was directed against them.

The attacks of the English Deists were repulsed in Germany and Holland by Le Clerc[4] and Lampe; by the latter, in his celebrated commentary upon the Gospel of John.[5] Two Englishmen, Priestley[6] and Simpson,[7] replied at once to Evanson. Storr and Süskind resolved the objections raised shortly after in Germany;[8] and that with such success, that Eckermann and Schmidt declared that they retracted their doubts.

[1] *Historisch-krit. Einleitung in das Neue Test.* 1875.

[2] Catalogue engraved on the pedestal of his statue, discovered at Rome in 1561.

[3] Ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννου εὐαγγελίου καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως.

[4] *Annotationes ad Hammond, Nov. Test.* 1714.

[5] *Commentarius in Evang. Johannis,* 1727.

[6] *Letters to a Young Man,* 1793.

[7] *An Essay on the Authenticity of the N. T.* 1793.

[8] In Flatt's Magazine, 1796, Number 4, and 1800, Number 6.

In the train of this first phase of the struggle, Eichhorn, Hug, Bertholdt, in their well-known Introductions to the New Testament, Wegscheider in a special work,[1] and others also, unanimously declared themselves in the direction of the authenticity; so that at the beginning of this century the storm seemed calmed down and the question decided in favour of the traditional opinion. The historian Gieseler, in his admirable little work on the origin of the Gospels (1818), decided in the same way, and gave expression to the opinion that John had composed his book for the instruction of those heathens who had already made some advance in the Christian religion.[2]

The work of Bretschneider, which all at once broke this apparent calm, called forth a multitude of replies, amongst which we shall cite only those of Olshausen,[3] of Crome,[4] and of Hauff,[5] and the first edition of the commentary of Lücke. At the close of the first of these publications, Bretschneider declared, as we have already said, that his objections were solved; so that once again the calm seemed restored, and Schleiermacher, with all his school, could devote himself, without encountering any opposition worthy of note, to the predilection which he felt for our Gospel. From the very beginning of his scientific career, Schleiermacher, in his *Discourses on Religion*, proclaimed the Christ of John as the true historic Christ, and maintained that the synoptic narrative must be subordinated to our Gospel. Critics so learned and independent as Schott and Credner in like manner supported at that time, in their Introductions, the side of the authenticity.[6] De Wette alone at that moment let a somewhat discordant voice be heard.

The appearance of the *Life of Jesus* by Strauss, in 1835, was thus like a thunderbolt bursting in a serene sky. That work called forth a whole legion of apologetic replies; above all, that of Tholuck on the credibility of the evangelical

[1] *Vollstandige Einleit. in das Evang. Johannis*, 1806.

[2] *Historisch-krit. Versuch über die Entstehung und die frühesten Schicksale der schriftlichen Evangelien.*

[3] *Die Echtheit der vier canonischen Evangelien*, 1823.

[4] *Probabilia haud probabilia*, 1824.

[5] *Die Authentic und der hohe Werth des Evang. Johannis*, 1831.

[6] That of Schott in 1830; that of Credner in 1836.

history,[1] and the *Life of Jesus* by Neander.[2] The concessions made to Strauss by the latter have often been erroneously interpreted. They had for their aim only to secure a minimum of indisputable facts, by giving up what might be the subject of attack. It is precisely this work, so moderate and impartial, and in which we feel at every word the unchangeable love of truth, which seemed for the moment to have made the greatest impression upon Strauss, and to have drawn from him, in reference to the Gospel of John, the species of retractation announced in his third edition.

Gfroerer[3] and Hase,[4] although setting out from quite different points of view from the two preceding writers, defended the authenticity of our Gospel against Strauss. Frommann,[5] on his side, refuted the hypothesis of Weisse. In the following years there appeared the work of Ebrard on the evangelical history,[6] the truth of which he valiantly defended against Strauss and Bruno Bauer and the third edition of the commentary of Lücke (1848). But the latter made such concessions in regard to the credibility of the discourses, and of the Christological teaching of John, that his opponents did not fail soon to turn his own work against the very thesis he had desired to defend.

We reach the last period—that of the struggle maintained with Baur and his school. Ebrard was the first to appear in the breach.[7] At his side a young savant presented himself, who, in a work filled with rare patristic erudition, and a science derived from the primary sources, sought to recall to the right path historical criticism, which, in the hands of Baur, seemed to him to have strayed from it. We speak of Thiersch, whose work, modestly entitled an *Essay*, is, even at this day, for beginners, one of the most useful means of discovering one's true position in the domain of the history of

[1] *Die Glaubwürdigkeit der evangel. Geschichte*, 1837.
[2] *Leben Jesu*, 1837.
[3] *Gesch. des Urchristenthums*, 1838.
[4] In the 3d edition of the *Life of Jesus*, 1840.
[5] *Ueber die Echtheit und Integrität des Evang. Joh.* 1840.
[6] *Wissenschaftliche Kritik der evangel. Geschichte*, 1st ed. 1842, 3d ed. 1868. [Eng. trans. of 2d ed., Edinburgh 1863.]
[7] *Das Evang. Joh. und die neueste Hypothese über seine Entstehung*, 1845.

the first two centuries.[1] Baur could not bear this call to order which was addressed to him—to him, a veteran in science—by so young a writer. Under a feeling of irritation, he wrote that violent pamphlet in which he accused his opponent of fanaticism, and which assumed almost the character of a denunciation.[2] The reply of Thiersch was as remarkable for its propriety and dignity of tone as for the excellence of the general observations which are there presented on the criticism of the sacred writings.[3] We may call in question the correctness of several of Thiersch's opinions, but it cannot be denied that his two works abound in ingenious and original points of view. A strange work appeared at that epoch. The author is usually quoted in German criticism under the name of "*The Anonymous Saxon.*" He is a Saxon theologian who then belonged to the Thurgovian clergy. He defended the authenticity of our Gospels; but with the intention of demonstrating by that very authenticity how the apostles of Jesus, authors of these books, or rather of these pamphlets, had only laboured to decry and vilify each other.[4]

The most skilful and learned reply to the works of Baur and of Zeller was that of Bleek in 1846.[5] Alongside of this writing the articles of Hauff deserve to be especially mentioned.[6] In the following years, Weitzel and Steitz discussed with great care and erudition the argument derived by Baur from the Paschal controversy at the end of the second century.[7] Following in the footsteps of Bindemann (1842), Semisch demonstrated the use of our four Gospels by Justin Martyr.[8]

[1] *Versuch zur Herstellung des historischen Standpuncts für die Kritik der neutest. Schriften*, 1845.

[2] *Der Kritiker und der Fanatiker in der Person des Herrn H. W. J. Thiersch*, 1846.

[3] *Einige Worte über die Echtheit der neutest. Schriften, zur Erwiderung*, etc., 1847.

[4] *Die Evangelien, ihr Geist, ihre Verfasser, und ihr Verhältniss zu einander*, 1845.

[5] *Beiträge zur Evangelien-kritik.*

[6] *Ueber die Composition des Johann. Evangeliums*, in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1846.

[7] Weitzel, *Die christliche Passahfeier der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, 1848; Steitz in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1856 and 1857.

[8] *Die apostolischen Denkwürdigkeiten des Märtyrers Justin*, 1848.

The year 1852 saw appear two very interesting writings, that of the Dutchman Niermeyer, designed to prove, by a discriminating and thorough study of the writings attributed to John, that the Apocalypse and the Gospel could and must both have been composed by him, and that the differences of substance and of form which distinguish them are to be explained by the profound spiritual revolution which took place in the apostle after the fall of Jerusalem.[1] A similar idea was at the same time expressed by Hase.[2] The second work is the commentary of Luthardt on the fourth Gospel, the first part of which contains a series of characteristic portraits of the principal actors in the evangelical drama, drawn after St. John, intended to make palpably visible the living reality of all these persons. These portraits are full of fine and correct touches.

We shall here bring together three authors: Hase,[3] Reuss,[4] and Ewald,[5] whose point of view in respect of our Gospel seems in general to agree. All the three defend the authenticity of the writing; but, what is almost inconceivable, they accord scarcely any historical credibility to the discourses which the apostle represents Jesus as delivering, and even to the miraculous deeds which He relates. That is an inconsistency on which Baur has severely animadverted in his reply to Hase. Such defences of a gospel are almost equivalent to sentences of condemnation pronounced against it,—or, rather, they mutually destroy each other. We may say of these almost what we say of the opinion of Bunsen, who views the Gospel of John as the only monument of evangelical history which proceeded from an eye-witness, who declares even that otherwise "there is no longer an historical Christ," and who yet consigns to the domain of fable a fact so decisive as that of the resurrection. Guericke and Bleek in their Intro-

[1] *Over de echtheid der johanneische Schriften*, etc., 1852. See the account given of this work in the *Revue de Théologie*, June, July, and September 1856.

[2] *Die Tübinger Schule, Sendschreiben an Baur*, 1855; *Vom Evangelium des Johannes*, 1866.

[3] *Leben Jesu*, 4th ed. 1854.

[4] *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Neuen Testaments*, 1st ed. 1842, 5th ed. 1874.

[5] *Jahrbücher der biblischen Wissenschaft*, 1851, 1853, 1860, 1865; *Die Johann. Schriften*, 1861.

duction to the New Testament,[1] Meyer, Hengstenberg, Lange in their commentaries, have pronounced in favour of the authenticity, as well as M. Astié (who adopts Niermeyer's point of view), as also the author of these pages.[2] The Johannine question in its relation to that of the synoptic Gospels has been treated in an instructive manner by MM. Sabatier[3] and de Pressensé.[4]

Let us here mention a strange notice which was published by Nolte, after a chronicle of the ninth century—that of George Hamartolos. It is a narrative attributed to Papias, according to whom the Apostle John was killed by the Jews.[5]

The study of the patristic testimonies has recently formed the subject of two works, the one of a very popular character, the other more strictly scientific: the small work of Tischendorf on the date of the composition of our Gospels,[6] and the academic programme of Riggenbach in 1866, relating to the historical and literary testimonies in favour of John's Gospel.[7] The solidity and impartiality of this latter work have been recognised by those who were opposed to the views of the author. To these two writings we may add that of Hofstede de Groot, professor at Groningen, in which he treats of the question of the date of Basilides, and of the Johannine quotations, especially in the Gnostic writers.[8] The cause of the authenticity has likewise been maintained by the Abbé Déramey (1868).[9] The tradition of the sojourn of John in Asia Minor has been valiantly defended, against Keim, by MM. Steitz[10] and Wabnitz.[11] Wittichen, regarding it from a point of view

[1] The chapters of Bleek relating to the Gospel of John have been translated into French by M. Bruston, under the title, *Etude critique sur l'évangile de Jean* [Eng. trans. of Bleek's *Introd. to N. T.*, Edinburgh 1870].

[2] *Explanation of the Gospel according to St. John*, 1863. *Commentary on John's Gospel*, 1864; trans. into German by Wunderlich, 1869; the conclusion, since 1866, by Wirz, under the title, *Prüfung der Streitfragen über das 4te Evang.*

[3] *Essays on the Sources of the Life of Jesus*, 1866.

[4] In the first book of the *Life of Jesus* [Eng. trans., London 1866].

[5] *Theologische Quartalschrift*, Tübingen 1862.

[6] *Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst?* 1865, 4th ed. 1866.

[7] *Die Zeugnisse für das Evang. Johannis neu untersucht.*

[8] *Basilides am Ausgang des apostolischen Zeitalters*, German ed. 1868.

[9] *Defence of the Fourth Gospel.*

[10] *Studien und Kritiken*, 1869.

[11] In the *Revue Théologique.*

which is peculiar to himself, gives up the sojourn of the Apostle John in Asia; but in order the better to support the authenticity of our Gospel, he maintains that it was composed by that apostle in Syria, to refute those Ebionites who had tendencies to Essenism. That writing would then date from the times which immediately followed the fall of Jerusalem. As to the John of Asia Minor, that would be the presbyter, author of the Apocalypse.[1] We have here the antipodes to the theses of Tübingen.

In two works, the one by Zahn, the other by Riggenbach, the question of the existence of the Presbyter John as distinct from the apostle has been discussed. These two authors, after a very careful study of the famous passage of Papias relative to that question, came to a negative conclusion.[2] This is the case, in like manner, with Leimbach in a very recent study,[3] and with Professor Milligan, of Aberdeen, in an article in the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, entitled "John the Presbyter" (Oct. 1867).

The historical credibility of the discourses of Jesus in the fourth Gospel has been defended against modern objections by Gess, in the first volume of the second edition of his work on the person of the Saviour;[4] and more especially by M. H. Meyer, in a very remarkable thesis for the degree of licentiate.[5] From the year 1872 dates the English work of Sanday;[6] and from 1873 that of the Superintendent Leuschner,[7] —a courageous little work, which specially attacks Keim and Scholten.

We have pleasure in concluding this review by mentioning two remarkable works: the critical study of Luthardt on the origin of the fourth Gospel, forming in a special volume the

[1] *Der geschichtliche Charakter des Evang. Joh.* 1869.

[2] Zahn, "Papias von Hierapolis," in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1866, 4th number; Riggenbach, "Johannes der Apostel und Presbyter," in the *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1868.

[3] *Das Papias Fragment*, 1875; reply to the work, *Das Papias Fragment des Eusebius*, by Weiffenbach, 1874.

[4] *Christi Person und Werk Neue Bearbeitung*, 1er Theil: *Christi Zeugniss*, etc., 1870.

[5] *Are the Discourses of the Fourth Gospel the Historical Discourses of Jesus?* 1872.

[6] *The Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel.*

[7] *Das Evang. Joh. und seine neuesten Widersacher.*

introduction to the second edition of his commentary, the first volume of which has just appeared;[1] and the brilliant article of Beyschlag in the *Studien und Kritiken*,[2] which perhaps contains the most decisive and intellectual answers to all the objections of present criticism. Even though we cannot admit the interpretation which the author gives to the Christological teaching contained in the discourses of the fourth Gospel, we hasten to render homage to that work from which we shall make numerous quotations in the following pages.

III. Urged by the force of the reasons for and against, a certain number of theologians have sought a middle position, suited to give satisfaction to both sides. Some have tried to make a selection between portions which are truly Johannine and those which are not authentic, but which have been interpolated at a later date. It is in this way that Weisse, whom we cannot exempt from including amongst the opponents of the authenticity, on account of the important place which he occupies in the development of that manner of view, would nevertheless be disposed to attribute to John himself some verses, such as ch. i. 1–5 and 9–14; also, certain passages in ch. iii.; finally, the discourses of ch. xiv.–xvii., while cutting off from them the dialogistic and narrative parts.

Schweizer has tried another mode of selection.[3] According to him, the narrations which have Galilee for the theatre of action must be eliminated from the Johannine writing; they have been added at a later time to facilitate the agreement between the narrative of John and that of the synoptic Gospels. Schenkel proposed to consider the discourses as the primitive work forming a whole, and the historical parts as added at a later date.[4] But since the unity of the composition of our Gospel has been triumphantly demonstrated, the division of it externally into parts of diverse origin has been given up. Weizsäcker maintains that there is certainly a difference to

[1] *Der Johan. Ursprung des vierten Evang.* 1874; *das Johann. Evang.*, 1er Theil, 1875 *ad fin.* [Eng. trans. by Gregory; Messrs. Clark, Edinburgh, 1876.]

[2] 1874, 1875, also separately.

[3] *Das Evang. Joh. nach seinem inneren Werth kritisch untersucht*, 1841. The author has since then withdrawn his hypothesis.

[4] *Studien und Kritiken*, 1840 (account of the work of Weisse). In a subsequent work he makes of it an ideal composition, dating from 110–120.

be established in that narrative; but it is not of a quantitative nature,—it is the whole narrative which, from the first to the last line, presents a double character, an historical character on the one side, a speculative one on the other. In this way, then, the author himself comes to be made two different persons: the one, the witness, from whom have proceeded in an oral form the information which constitutes the substance of the book; the other, the editor, who has collected this information from the mouth of the former, and from it has composed our Gospel. Thus Paulus, in his account of the work of Bretschneider,[1] proposed to attribute the redaction to a disciple of the Apostle John,—a disciple who had himself attended the ministry of the Lord in Palestine, and who composed that didactic work with the aim of blending the Judæo-Christian belief in the Messiah manifested in Jesus with the idea of the Logos as it was taught by Philo. It is almost the same idea which reappears in the hypothesis which has been developed by M. Michel Nicolas.[2] One of the members of the Christian society of Ephesus took as a guide the teaching of the Apostle John, and sketched a tableau of the work of Jesus Christ. That writer was the person who in the smaller Epistles is called *the Elder*, and with whom history has made us acquainted under the name of *John the Presbyter*.

Tobler, in like manner, maintains that alongside of the ideal character of the narrative there are features truly historical, chronological and geographical notices for example, which can rest only upon testimony of a very exact nature. The witness was the Apostle John, according to whose instructions Apollos, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, composed our Gospel before the end of the first century.[3]

In the 13th edition of his *Life of Jesus*, M. Renan, after having scrupulously weighed the reasons in favour of these different hypotheses, arrives at this conclusion, that a half Gnostic sectary constituted himself the editor of the narratives of the aged apostle; perhaps he even possessed some notes dictated by the latter, and which formed the primary

[1] *Heidelberger Jahrbücher*, 1821.
[2] *Etudes critiques sur la Bible; Nouveau Testament*, 1862.
[3] *Die Evangelien-Frage*, etc., 1858; *Zeitschrift für wissensch. Theol.* 1860.

materials of his work. Thus M. Renan explains, on the one side, the obvious features of authenticity; and, on the other, the not less indisputable characters, in his eyes, of a composition of later date and of an artificial nature.

Finally, Weizsäcker,[1] in a work which we may be allowed to call masterly, thinks that he can discover, even in the text of the Gospel, traces of a distinction between the evangelistic editor and the apostolic witness, on whose credibility the former gives the narrative. The editor has carefully worked up what he had gathered from John's narratives, and believes that he is able to put into the mouth of Jesus Himself what he had heard related by that apostle of the impression produced on him by the person of the Saviour. We may compare with this result certain expressions which have proceeded from the pen of Holtzmann, in the articles of Schenkel's[2] *Biblical Dictionary*. We conclude this exposition by again mentioning the third edition of the *Introduction to the New Testament* of Bleek, which we owe to the care of Professor Mangold. Whilst Bleek maintains in that noble work the authenticity of the fourth Gospel, his present editor[3] accompanies his argument with very instructive critical notes, which put the reader *au fait* with all the details of recent discussions, and the bearing of which is tolerably sceptical. The external evidences would appear to the author sufficient to confirm the authenticity; but the internal difficulties seem to him, up to the present time at least, insurmountable.[4]

This long enumeration, in which we have included only the more remarkable works, proves of itself alone the gravity of the question. A century will soon have elapsed since all the forces of science have been drawn up to sweep away or to defend this position. Long ago the Emperor Julian already indicated its supreme importance in that saying which is attributed to him, "It is this John who, in declaring that the Word was made flesh, has done all the evil."[5] The Johannine question has become the decisive question, not only in the

[1] *Untersuchungen über die evangel. Geschichte*, 1864.

[2] *Bibellexicon*, art. "Evang. Joh.," book ii. 1869; and "Johannes der Apostel," vol. iii. 1871.

[3] *Einleitung in das N. T.*, von Fr. Bleek; 3 Aufl., von W. Mangold, 1875.

[4] P. 281.

[5] *Cyril, Contra Julianum.*

domain of criticism, but also in that of Christology,—that is to say, of Christianity itself. We shall commence by treating of *the Apostle John;* we shall then study the *Johannine Gospel* and its characters; and we shall end in seeking to solve the problem of the *origin* of that work.

BOOK FIRST.

THE APOSTLE ST. JOHN.

I.

JOHN IN HIS FATHER'S HOUSE.

ALL the documents set forth that John was a native of Galilee. He belonged to that northern population, with whose lively, industrious, independent, warlike character Josephus has made us acquainted. The pressure exerted on the nation by the religious authorities who had their head-quarters at Jerusalem, did not weigh so heavily on that distant country. More free from prejudice, more open to the immediate impression of the truth, Galilean hearts presented to Jesus that receptive soil which His work demanded. Thus all His apostles, with the exception of Judas Iscariot, seem to have belonged to that province, and it was there that He succeeded in laying the foundations of His church.

John dwelt on those shores of the lake of Gennezareth which at the present day only present to view a vast solitude, but which were then covered with towns and villages, all containing, according to Josephus, several thousands of inhabitants. Had John, as has been frequently said, his home at Bethsaida? Such is the conclusion drawn from Luke v. 9, where he is designated, along with his brother James, as the *associate* of Simon; and from John i. 44, where Bethsaida is called the *city of Andrew and Peter*. But we may also think of Capernaum, which could not have been very far distant from the hamlet of Bethsaida, since on coming out of the synagogue of that town Jesus entered the house of Peter,

who, according to the preceding verses, dwelt at Bethsaida (Mark i. 29).

The family of John consisted of four persons known to us —his brother James, who seems to have been the eldest, as he is generally named before him; their father, Zebedee, who was a fisherman (Mark i. 19, 20); and their mother, who must have borne the name of Salome; for in the two manifestly parallel passages, Matt. xxvii. 56 and Mark xv. 40, in which the women are named who were present at the crucifixion of Jesus, the name of Salome is in Mark the equivalent of the title of *the mother of the sons of Zebedee* in Matthew. Wieseler has sought to prove that Salome was the sister of Mary the mother of Jesus,—from whence it would follow that John would have been the cousin-german of the Lord.[1] We cannot regard that hypothesis as having a sufficient foundation, either exegetically or historically. The enumeration in John xix. 25, in which Wieseler finds four persons: 1st, the mother of Jesus; 2d, the sister of His mother; 3d, Mary the wife of Cleophas; and 4th, Mary Magdalene,—seems to us only to include three, the words *Mary the wife of Cleophas* being quite naturally the explanatory apposition of the latter words, *sister of His mother* (see the exegesis). And how should our Gospels not present some trace of so close a relationship? Wieseler asks, it is true, how two sisters should each have borne the name of Mary. But there is nothing to prevent the word *sister* from being here taken, as it often is, in the sense of *sister-in-law*. That signification is all the more probable, since, according to a very ancient tradition (Hegesippus), Cleophas was Joseph's brother, and Mary's brother-in-law.

The family of John were in the enjoyment of a certain competency. According to Mark i. 20, indeed, Zebedee had day-labourers. Salome is reckoned (Luke viii. 3; Matt. xxvii. 55) amongst the number of the women who accompanied Jesus in His journeyings, and who *ministered* to Him and to the Twelve *of their substance*. According to our Gospel (xix. 27), John possessed a house of his own, into which he received the mother of the Lord. Must we reckon, as has been done, amongst these signs of prosperity the connection of that family with the high priest, of which mention is made

[1] *Studien und Kritiken*, 1840.

xviii. 15? That conclusion has so much the less foundation, since it cannot be proved that *the other disciple* mentioned in that passage was one of the sons of Zebedee, either John or James. The prosperous position of that family was doubtless due to the trade, at that time very lucrative, of fishing, and to the considerable commerce which was connected with it.[1] Two traits of the life of Salome betray a lively religious sentiment: the eagerness with which she consecrated herself, as we have just seen, to the service of Jesus, and the request which she had one day the boldness to present to the Lord on behalf of her two sons (Matt. xx. 20). Such a prayer reveals an enthusiastic heart, an ardent piety, but imbued with Messianic hopes of the most earthly nature. She had doubtless laboured to heighten the religious patriotism of her sons in the same direction. Thus, as soon as the forerunner appeared on the scene, John hastened to his baptism. He even attached himself to him as his disciple (John i.); and it was whilst he was in his company that Jesus met him, on his return from the desert whither he had gone after his baptism.[2]

II.

JOHN IN THE SUITE OF JESUS.

As John had passed without any mental shock from his father's house to the baptism of the forerunner, he seems in like manner to have passed without internal commotion from the school of the latter to that of Jesus. In this gently progressive development there was no wrench. He had only to follow the attraction within, the teaching of the Father, according to the profound expressions of which he himself makes use, in order to rise, step by step, to the very summit of truth. This is the royal road described in that saying of our Lord to Nicodemus: "He that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God" (John iii. 21). By this calm and continuous character of his development, John is found to be, in the spiritual

[1] See Lücke's *Commentary*, introduction, p. 9.

[2] We refer for the justification of these data to the exegesis of John i.

world, the antipodes of Paul. The narrative of his call as a believer has been preserved to us in the first chapter of our Gospel. For everything leads us to believe that the disciple who accompanied Andrew in that decisive hour of the foundation of the new society was none other than John himself. Jesus was then returning from the banks of the Jordan with him and some other young Galileans whom He had attached to Himself in Galilee, first to Cana, then to Nazareth, which He left soon afterwards in company with His mother and His brethren, to come and settle with them at Capernaum (John ii. 12, compare with Matt. iv. 13). As He Himself still belonged to His family, Jesus had undoubtedly sent these young people back to the bosom of their own circle. But when, soon after, the moment arrived for undertaking His work in Judea, in the theocratic capital, He must call them to follow Him in a permanent manner, and to break off for themselves as well as for Him the ties of family. This new call took place on the shores of the lake of Gennezareth, near Capernaum. It is narrated in Matt. iv. 18 and parallel passages. At a later period, the company of His disciples becoming more and more numerous, He selected twelve amongst them, on whom He conferred the special title of *apostles* (Luke vi. 12 ff.; Mark iii. 13 ff.). In the first rank were John and James, with their two friends Simon and Andrew. And soon, from amongst the four, the two sons of Zebedee and Simon found themselves honoured by the special friendship of Jesus. Thus we see them alone admitted to the raising of Jairus' daughter, and to the two scenes of the transfiguration and of Gethsemane. John was likewise charged, along with Peter, with the secret mission of preparing the Passover (Luke xxii. 8). It was doubtless this kind of partiality, with which he as well as his brother were favoured, that emboldened Salome to ask for them the first places in the Messiah's kingdom. Are we to admit in favour of John a still closer degree of select intimacy? Must we see in him that disciple of whom Jesus had made His friend, in the strictest sense of the word, and who, in the fourth Gospel, is several times designated as *the disciple whom Jesus loved?* (xiii. 23, xix. 26, xx. 2, xxi. 7, 20 ff.). That was the unanimous opinion of the church in the age which followed the apostolic times.

Irenæus says: "John, the disciple of the Lord who rested on His bosom, also published the gospel whilst he dwelt at Ephesus in Asia."[1] Polycrates, the bishop of Ephesus, expressly says: "John, who rested on the bosom of the Lord . . . . is buried at Ephesus."[2] John even bore that title, *the disciple who rests in the bosom of the Master* (μαθητὴς ἐπιστηθιος). Lützelberger is the first who has disputed the application to John of the passages quoted, and who has maintained that the disciple loved by Jesus was Andrew the brother of Peter. But why should that apostle, who is designated several times by his own name in the first part of the Gospel (i. 41, 45, vi. 8, xii. 22), be all at once designated in the second by that anonymous expression? Späth has supposed that the beloved disciple is the one who is called Nathanael (John i. 46 ff.); that this name, which signifies *the gift of God*, designates the son of Zebedee as the ideal disciple —the true gift of God to His Son.[3] But why, in that case, designate him sometimes under the name of Nathanael (i. 46, xxi. 2), sometimes by that mysterious circumlocution? Holtzmann likewise identifies the disciple whom Jesus loved with Nathanael, but sees in that personage only the purely ideal type of Paulinism.[4] Scholten also considers that anonymous disciple as a fictitious personage, who, in the opinion of the author, would be the symbol of true Christianity in opposition to the Twelve.[5]

Is it worth the trouble to refute such vagaries of the imagination? In ch. xix. the author certainly makes of that disciple a real being, since it was to him that Jesus entrusted His mother, and who received her into his own home; unless it be intended to interpret also in a symbolical sense that mother entrusted by Jesus, and to see in her nothing more than the church itself. That signification would, in point of arbitrariness, surpass the masterpieces of allegorical interpretation to which this passage has sometimes given rise among Catholic writers. In reading the fourth Gospel, we cannot doubt that the disciple whom Jesus loved was first of all one

[1] *Adv. Hær.* iii. 1.

[2] Eusebius, v. 24 (ἐν Ἐφέσῳ κεκοίμηται).

[3] Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1868.

[4] Schenkel's *Bibellexicon*, vol. iv. art. "Nathanäel."

[5] In the brochure, *Der Apostel Johannes in Klein Asien.*

of the Twelve, then one of the three who enjoyed the special intimacy of the Saviour. Now Peter, being several times named *along with* that disciple, cannot be the apostle thus designated. James died too early (about the year 44, Acts xii.) for the report ever to have been disseminated in the church that he should not die (John xxi.). Of these three, John is then the only one to whom that designation could apply. This is the result at which we likewise arrive by another way. In John xxi. 2, seven disciples are designated: "Simon Peter, Thomas called Didymus, Nathanael of Cana in Galilee, the sons of Zebedee, and two other disciples." Amongst these seven was to be found he whom Jesus loved, since he plays a part in the following scene (vv. 20 ff.). Now it cannot be either Peter, or Thomas, or Nathanael, all of whom are mentioned by name in the course of the Gospel and in this very passage, nor the two last disciples, who are not named as belonging to the number of the Twelve. It remains, then, only to choose between the two sons of Zebedee; and between the two it is not possible to hesitate.

In the conduct of John during the ministry of his Master, two features strike us—a reserve, carried even to an extreme degree, and a vivacity amounting sometimes even to violence. The fourth Gospel loves to relate to us the striking words of Peter; it speaks of the conversations of Andrew and of Philip with Jesus, of the manifestations of devotion or of incredulity on the part of Thomas. In the Synoptics, Peter speaks at every moment. But in the one and the other narrative, John plays only a very secondary and undiscernible part. Three sayings only are attributed to him in our Gospel, and they are all three remarkable for their brevity: "Master, where dwellest Thou?" (i. 38). "Lord, who is it?" (xiii. 25). "It is the Lord!" (xxi. 7). Moreover, of these three words, the first was probably uttered by Andrew, and the second issued from the mouth of John only at the instance of Peter. What is the significance then of this feature, which apparently contrasts with the very peculiar relation of that disciple to Jesus? That John was one of those natures which live more within than without themselves. Whilst Peter occupied the foreground of the scene, speaking or acting, John kept himself in the background, observing, contemplating, drinking in love and light,

and contented with his part of dumb personage, which was so well suited to his profound and receptive nature. We understand the charm which that character must have possessed for the Lord. He found in that relation, which remained their common secret, that complement which manly natures seek in family ties. Alongside of this feature, which reveals a character naturally timid and reflective, we meet with certain facts in which John betrays a vivacity of impression capable of rising even to passion; as when, with his brother, he proposed to Jesus to make fire come down from heaven upon the Samaritan village which had refused to receive Him (Luke ix. 54); or when he becomes irritated at the sight of the man who, without joining himself to the disciples, took the liberty of driving out devils in the name of Jesus, and whom he forbade to continue to act in such a manner (Luke ix. 49). We may compare with these two features that request for the first place in the Messiah's kingdom, by which we prove the existence of the impure alloy which still mingled with his faith.

How are we to explain two features of character apparently so opposite? There exist profound receptive natures which are accustomed to shut up their impressions within themselves, and this all the more that these impressions are keen and thrilling. But if it happens that these persons once cease to be masters of themselves, their long restrained emotions then burst forth in sudden explosions, which fill the persons around them with amazement. Does not the character of John belong to this order? And when Jesus gave to him and his brother the surname of *Boanerges, sons of thunder*[1] (Mark iii. 17), could He have described them better? I cannot think that, by that surname, Jesus intended, as all the old writers have believed, to signalize the eloquence which distinguished them. Neither can I allow that He desired by that surname to perpetuate the recollection of their anger in one of the cases indicated. We are led by what precedes to a more natural explanation, and one more worthy of Jesus Himself.

As electricity is stored up by degrees in the cloud until it bursts forth suddenly in the lightning and thunderbolt, so in those two loving and passionate natures impressions silently

[1] Béné réges (בני רגש).

accumulated till the moment when the heart overflowed, and they took an unexpected and violent flight. We love to represent St. John to ourselves as of a gentle rather than of an energetic nature, tender even to weakness. Do not his writings insist before and above all else upon love? Were not the last sermons of the old man: "Love one another"? That is true; but we forget other features of a different kind, during the first and last periods of his life, which reveal something decisive, sharp, absolute, even violent in his disposition.

If we take all the facts stated into consideration, we shall recognise in him one of those sensitive, ardent souls, worshippers of an ideal, who attach themselves at first sight, and without reservation, to that being who seems to them to realize that of which they have dreamt, and whose devotion easily becomes exclusive and intolerant. They feel themselves repelled by everything which is not in sympathy with their enthusiasm. They no longer understand a division of heart which they themselves know not how to practise. All for all! Such is their motto. Where that all is not, there is in their eyes nothing. Such affections do not subsist without including an alloy of impure egoism. A divine work is needed, in order that the true devotion, which constitutes the basis of such, may shine forth at the last in all its sublimity. Such was, if we are not deceived, the inmost history of John.

III.

JOHN AT THE HEAD OF THE JUDÆO-CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

The part which John acted in the church after Pentecost was that for which these antecedents have prepared us. On that stage where were moving and acting, Peter, James the brother of John, the first martyr amongst the apostles, mere apostolic assistants like Stephen and Philip, lastly Paul and James the brother of the Lord, John appears only on two occasions: when he went to the temple with Peter (Acts iii.), and when he accompanied that same apostle to Samaria to complete the work begun by Philip (Acts viii.). And in these

two instances Peter was each time the one who played the principal part; John seems only to have been his assistant. As we have seen, the disciple whom Jesus loved was not a man of external action, one who took the initiative, a conqueror; his mission, like his talent, was of a more spiritual, a more exalted nature, and his hour was not to sound till a later time. In the meanwhile, a mighty work, a continuation of that which Jesus had begun in him, was operating on his mind. In him was being accomplished that promise which he has himself preserved to us: "The Spirit shall glorify me in you." He had yielded himself up; he found himself again like a new man, glorified in his Master; and he gave himself to Him with still greater devotion. For the moment, moreover, he had an altogether special task which that dying Master had bequeathed to him. To Peter, Jesus had entrusted the direction of the church; to John, the care of attending to His mother.

Where did Mary dwell? It is not at all probable that she felt any attraction for a sojourn in Jerusalem. Her most cherished remembrances recalled her to Galilee. It was there also, on the shores of the lake of Gennezareth, that John undoubtedly possessed that *home* where he received her, and lavished on her the attentions of filial piety. That circumstance enables us to understand why in those first times he took so small a share in missionary work. Lastly, if he had lived at Jerusalem, Paul would doubtless have seen him, as well as Peter and James, at the time of his first visit to that city after his conversion (Gal. i. 18, 19).

This state of things changed after the death of Mary. Subsequent traditions, which nothing prevents us from regarding as well founded, place that event about the year 48. From that moment John took an important part in the direction of the Christian work. At the date of the assembly, commonly called the council of Jerusalem (Acts xv.), in 50 or 51, he met Paul in the capital, and the latter classes him (Gal. ii.) amongst those who were regarded as pillars of the church.[1] An important question regarding John, which has been the subject of great discussion, here presents itself.

The Tübingen school attributes to these three persons,

[1] Gal. ii. 9: "James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars."

James, Peter, and John, who represented the Jewish Christian church, an opinion opposed to that of Paul on the subject of the maintenance of legal observances in the church. The only difference which it recognises between the apostles and the *false brethren, unawares brought in,* of whom Paul speaks (Gal. ii. 4),—and that is not to the advantage of the former,—would be this: the false brethren, the pharisaical intruders, kept their ground firmly before Paul, and tried to make him yield; whilst the apostles, intimidated by his energy and by the brilliancy of his successes amongst the Gentiles, abandoned *in fact* their point of view, and agreed in spite of themselves to share with him the labour of the missionary field. That would be the very feeble significance of that sign of co-operation which the apostles gave to Paul and Barnabas when they extended to them the right hand of fellowship at the moment of separation (ver. 9). If such had been the personal conviction of John, it is obvious that he could not be the author of the fourth Gospel, or that he could be so only on condition of having previously undergone a complete transformation. Hence arises the interest which attaches to that question.

The point of view of the Tübingen school has for its basis a hypothesis, which is, that the principle of the abolition of the law was one of Paul's discoveries, which he found the means of imposing on the church. But is it possible then to efface from our Gospels the elements of the purest spiritualism, contained in the teaching of Jesus Himself? Does not that single sentence: "It is not that which entereth into a man which defiles the man, but that which cometh out of the *heart of the man,*"[1] comprehend in principle the abolition of the entire Levitical law? When Jesus declares that He Himself, He, the Son of man, is *Lord even of the Sabbath,*[2] not assuredly in order to glorify Himself on that prerogative, but to produce the anticipation that the day would come when He would make use of it in reality, did He not by that undermine the basis of the old Sabbatical ordinance under its Mosaic form, and thereby the whole ceremonial institution of which the Sabbath was the centre? Does not Jesus, finally, in comparing the new economy to a *new garment* which must be substituted all of a piece for the old, seeing that it would

[1] Matt. xv. 18-20; Mark vii. 18-20. [2] Mark ii. 28.

be useless to seek to patch up the latter,[1]—does He not express Himself on the subject of the law from a point of view which the apostle of the Gentiles could not go beyond? And is it not the apostles who have transmitted to the church these words which are recorded in our Synoptics? And even if they had not from the first perceived all the practical consequences, would it be admissible, when they found themselves face to face with the assertions of Paul, which were merely an application of them, that the latter should have appeared so strange to them? Independently, then, of the narrative in the Acts, of which we do not wish here to make use, since the school with which we contend calls its credibility in question, we must conclude from all this that what is (wrongly) called Paulinism must have existed as a latent conviction in the mind of the apostles, in which those words of the Master were indelibly engraved.

And, indeed, if Paul had not reckoned on the consent of the Twelve, would he have come to Jerusalem to invoke their authority to shut the mouth of the Judaizing brethren who troubled the church of Antioch, and in order, as he said, *that he might not have run in vain* in the past, *might not run in vain* in the future?[2] And that hope was not deceived. In Gal. ii. 3, he expressly opposes to the narrowness of the false brethren (*the Pharisees who had believed*, Acts xv. 5, xi. 3) the liberality of the apostles, who did not *impose* on him, in the case of the Gentiles, as a condition of their entrance into the church, anything which went beyond *the statement* which he had made to them of his manner of procedure down to the present time.[3] From which it results: 1st, That, in contradiction to the conduct of the false brethren, the apostles recognised the liberty of the Gentiles in regard to the law; 2d, That the observance of the law was not in their eyes a condition of salvation; 3d, That they did not maintain it, for themselves and for believers amongst the

[1] Matt. ix. 16 and parallels.

[2] Compare the marked antithesis: "*But* on the part of those who are the most esteemed ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι," ver. 6, with the part of the intrusive false brethren, vv. 4 and 5.

[3] The relationship of the words to *impose* and to *expound* (*imposer et exposer*) gives up to a certain point the antithesis of προσανέθεντο (to add to), ver. 6, and of ἀνεθέμην (ver. 1 expounded), ver. 2.

Jews, except as a national institution, proceeding from God, and from which God alone could emancipate them. The only difference with Paul is, that the latter saw that emancipation already implied in the death of the cross, as he precisely demonstrated it to Peter in the discourse narrated in Gal. ii. The mission of the apostles to Israel would not, moreover, have permitted them to break the external bond which united them to their people. They would *have run in vain* if they had freed themselves from that yoke, as well as St. Paul, if *he* had wished to lay it on the Gentiles. They thus found themselves permanently in the position in which Paul occasionally found himself when he had to put in practice that principle: "to put himself under the law with those who are under the law" (1 Cor. ix. 20).[1]

Irenæus has very faithfully reproduced that line of conduct in these words: "They themselves (the apostles) persevered in the old observances, conducting themselves piously regarding the institution of the law; but for us Gentiles, they granted us liberty, committing us to the Holy Spirit."[2]

The second part of the second chapter, relating to the controversy between Paul and Peter at Antioch,[3] confirms that conclusion. The decree of the meeting at Jerusalem, proposed by James, tended, in certain circumstances unforeseen at first, to lead to a contradiction. On the one side, the Jewish Christians were to continue to observe the law. On the other, in the churches where the two elements of Jewish and Gentile origin were found united, brotherly fellowship became impossible under these conditions. Now the church of Antioch was placed in this position at the time of Peter's visit. Following at first the generous impulses of his own heart, the apostle made the duty of union the predominating principle of his conduct, renouncing for a season the observance of the Levitical ordinances. But that was at the expense of the purport of the decree; and when the new-comers, arriving from Jerusalem, recalled him to the strict path marked out by that document for the Jewish Christians, he had not the boldness to break with that authority, but gave way. St. Paul calls that *dissimulation*

[1] Comp. Acts xxi., his Nazarite vow at Jerusalem.
[2] *Adv. Hær.* iii. 12.
[3] Gal. ii. 11 ff.

and *hypocrisy*,—expressions which prove that Peter had not yielded through conviction, but through force and fear. This is the result, moreover, which follows from the comparison instituted by Paul between his conduct and that of Barnabas, whose principles were certainly in harmony with those of Paul. (Comp. ver. 1.) The conduct of Peter on that occasion can no more serve to demonstrate as existing in him a conviction contrary to that of Paul, than his denial in the court of the high priest can prove in him an apostasy from the faith.

We know that this second chapter of Galatians is like the fortress of the Tübingen school, and we have nevertheless just seen how little reason that school has to take its stand upon that passage. It is unnecessary, then, to lay down a revolution as having taken place in the mind of John, which would have qualified him, after Pentecost, to become the author of the fourth Gospel. To be able to write such a book, it was enough that he should become by Pentecost a true believer according to the mind and heart of Jesus.

IV.

JOHN IN ASIA MINOR.[1]

From the time of the council of Jerusalem we quite lose sight of John till the moment when tradition depicts him to us accomplishing his apostolic ministry amongst the churches of Asia Minor. It is not probable that he repaired to those distant countries before the overthrow of Jerusalem. He rather accompanied the Jewish-Christian church when it emigrated to Perea, at the time when the war broke out against the Romans. This departure took place about the year 67.[1] Only at a later date, when, in consequence of the death of Paul, and perhaps after that of his assistants in Asia Minor, Titus and Timotheus, the churches of that country, which were of such importance, found themselves deprived of every apostolic guide, John repaired thither. He was probably not the only apostle or apostolic personage who selected that place of abode. Ancient traditions speak of

[1] Ewald, *Gesch. des Volks Israel*, vol. vi. p. 642.

the ministry of Philip, either the apostle or the deacon, at Hierapolis. There are likewise some indications of a sojourn at Ephesus by Andrew.[1] As Thiersch says, "The church's centre of gravity was *no longer* at Jerusalem; it was *not yet* at Rome; it was at Ephesus." Like a circle of golden candlesticks, the flourishing and numerous churches, established by Paul in Ionia and in Phrygia, were the luminous point towards which were directed the eyes of all Christendom. "From the fall of Jerusalem," says Lücke, "throughout the course of the second century, Asia Minor was the most living portion of the church." What excited an interest in these churches was not only the energy of their faith, but the intensity of the struggle which they had to maintain against heresy. "For I know this," St. Paul had said to the pastors of Ephesus and of Miletus, "that after my departure grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock; also of your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them" (Acts xx. 29, 30). That prophecy was fulfilled. The maintenance of evangelical truth demanded at that moment powerful aid. It is not surprising, then, that John, one of the last survivors amongst the apostles, should feel himself called upon to supply in those countries the place of the Apostle of the Gentiles, and to water, as Apollos had formerly done in Greece, that which Paul had planted.

The accounts of John's sojourn in Asia are numerous and positive. Nevertheless, Keim and Scholten, following the example of Vogel, of Reuterdahl, and above all of Lützelberger, have in these latter days disputed the truth of that tradition. The former thinks that the personage named John, whom Polycarp had known, was not the apostle, but the presbyter of the same name who must have lived at Ephesus towards the close of the first century, and that Irenæus erroneously, or perhaps willingly, imagined that that master of his master was the apostle. This is where the error begins, which has since then been so universally disseminated. Scholten believes rather that as the Apocalypse was falsely attributed to the Apostle John, and as the author of that book appeared to have lived in Asia (Rev. ii. and iii.), the conclu-

[1] So in the so-called Fragment of Muratori.

sion has been drawn from these erroneous premises that the Apostle John had his abode in Asia.

Let us begin by establishing the tradition, the value of which we shall afterwards estimate.

Irenæus says: "All the presbyters who met in Asia with John, the disciple of the Lord, testify that he has transmitted to them these things; for he lived with them till the time of Trajan.[1] And some among them have seen, not only John, but also other apostles."[2] The whole passage, but especially the last sentence, implies that it is *the apostle* who is referred to, and not some other John. This is brought out still more decidedly in the following words: "Afterwards John, the disciple of the Lord, *he who reclined on His breast*, published the gospel whilst he dwelt at Ephesus in Asia."[3] We read elsewhere: "And the church of Ephesus, founded by Paul, and in which John lived down till the time of Trajan, is also a truthful witness of the tradition of the apostles."[4] And again: "Polycarp had not only been instructed by the apostles, and lived with several men who had seen Christ, but he had been instituted bishop in the church of Smyrna *by the apostles* who were in Asia; and we ourselves have seen him in our early youth, for he lived a very long time, and became very aged, and departed this life after a glorious martyrdom—having constantly taught that which he had heard *from the apostles*."[5] We cannot doubt, then, that the following words apply to the apostle: "That number (666) is found in all accurate and ancient manuscripts, and it is attested by all those *who have seen John face to face*."[6]

Thus speaks Irenæus in his principal work. Besides that, we possess two letters of his, in which he expresses himself to the same purport. One is addressed to Florinus, his former fellow-disciple with Polycarp, who had embraced the doctrines of the Gnostics. Irenæus says to him: "These are not the precepts which the elders who preceded us, and who lived after the apostles, have transmitted to thee; for I have seen thee, whilst I was still a child, in Asia Minor with

[1] As far as these words we quote according to the Greek text cited by Eusebius, *H. E.* iii. 23. 3.

[2] These last words are according to the Latin translation, *Adv. Hær.* ii. 22. 5.

[3] Irenæus, iii. 1. 1 (Eusebius, v. 8. 4).

[4] iii. 3. 4 (Eusebius, iii. 23. 4).

[5] iii. 3. 4 (Eusebius, iv. 14).

[6] v. 30. 1 (Eusebius, v. 8).

Polycarp. . . . And I could still show thee the place where he sat when he taught, and gave an account of *his relations with John and with the others who had seen the Lord*, and how he spoke of what he had heard from them concerning the Lord, —His miracles and His doctrine,—and how he transmitted, in perfect harmony with the Scriptures, all that he had received from eye-witnesses of the Word of life."[1] The other letter is addressed by Irenæus to Victor, Bishop of Rome, on the occasion of the controversy waged about the subject of Easter: "When the blessed Polycarp," he said to him, "visited Rome in the time of Anicetus, slight differences having arisen on some points, peace was very soon concluded. And they did not even give way to a discussion on the principal question. For Anicetus could not dissuade Polycarp *from observing* [the 14th Nisan as the day of the Passover], seeing that he had always observed it with John, the disciple of our Lord, and *the other apostles* with whom he had lived. And on his side, Polycarp could not persuade Anicetus *to observe* [that same day], the latter replying that he ought to maintain the customs which he had received from his predecessors. Matters being thus, they administered to each other the communion, and in the assembly Anicetus ceded to Polycarp as a mark of honour the administration of the Eucharist; and they parted from each other in peace." Thus at Rome and in Gaul, not less than in Asia Minor, Polycarp was truly regarded as the disciple of John *the apostle;* and the arguments of the Roman bishops were twice shattered in the second century, in 160 (or rather 155) and in 190, against that fact, which was established for all beyond any question.

We find in Asia Minor, about the year 180, another witness of the same tradition. Apollonius, an anti-Montanist writer, related at that time that John had brought to life a dead man at Ephesus.[2] And it is indubitably to the apostle that he attributes that act. For he here speaks of the author of the Apocalypse; and we know that at that date the churches of

[1] Eusebius, v. 24.

[2] Eusebius, v. 28: "He also makes use of testimonies taken from the Apocalypse of John, and relates that a dead man had been brought to life again at Ephesus by the same John."

Asia did not question the composition of that book by the apostle.

But even anterior to Irenæus and Apollonius, Justin contains some words regarding John which imply the idea of his sojourn in Asia. He says: "A man among us, *one of the apostles of the Christ*, has prophesied in the revelation which was given to him" (*ἐν ἀποκαλύψει γενομένῃ αὐτῷ*). The fact of the composition of the Apocalypse in Asia not being doubtful (although Scholten seems desirous of disputing it), it follows from these words of Justin that he represented to himself the apostle as inhabiting Asia. That declaration is so much the more interesting, that it occurs in the report of a public discussion which Justin had to maintain at Ephesus with a learned Jew. The work dates from 150–160.

Finally, we possess an official document, emanating from the bishops of Asia about the close of the second century, which attests their unanimous conviction on the subject with which we are dealing. That is the letter which Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, addressed to Victor, under the same circumstances which called forth that of Irenæus quoted above (about 190) He, in whose family the office of bishop of that metropolis was as it were hereditary (since seven of his relations had occupied it before him), writes, with the assent of all the bishops of the province who are around him, the following words: "We celebrate the true day. . . . For some great lights are extinguished in Asia, and will rise again there on the return of the Lord. . . . Philip, one of the twelve apostles, . . . and John, who rested on the bosom of the Lord, who was high priest, and wore the plate of gold, and who was witness and teacher, and who is buried at Ephesus. . . . All those have celebrated the Passover on the fourteenth day, according to the Gospel."[1]

Such are the witnesses proceeding from Asia Minor. They are not the only ones. We can add to them one who came from Egypt. Clement of Alexandria, about 190, in the preamble to the narrative of that young man whom John recalled in Asia from the error of his ways, wrote these words: "After the tyrant was dead, John returned from the isle of Patmos to Ephesus, and there he visited the surrounding

[1] Eusebius, v. 24. 3; compare iii. 31. 3.

countries in order to establish bishops and to organize the churches."[1]

We omit subsequent witnesses (Tertullian, Origen, Jerome, Eusebius), who naturally rely upon the older narratives.

And by what means is it sought to shake such an ancient and widely established tradition?

The Acts of the Apostles, says Keim, do not speak of such a sojourn by John in Asia. Is the man serious who speaks thus? With such logic, replies Leuschner, it could also be proved that Paul is not yet dead. As if the Book of the Acts was a biography of the apostles, and as if it was not finished before the time when John could have dwelt in Asia!

But the silence of the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians, and of the Pastoral Epistles? adds Scholten. As if the composition of these writings in the second century was a fact so indisputably demonstrated that we can make of them a point of departure for subsequent conclusions! Could critical presumption go further?

But the silence of the letters of Ignatius and of those of Polycarp is urged with more probability. Ignatius recalls to the Ephesians, Polycarp to the Philippians, the ministry of Paul in their churches; they are both silent concerning that of John in Asia! But in what terms does Ignatius remind the Ephesians of the Apostle St. Paul? "You are," he says to them, "*the place of passage* (παράδος) of those who have been taken away to God, the co-initiated of Paul, the consecrated, . . . in whose footsteps may I be found."[2] Riggenbach and Leuschner have shown that it is not the ministry of Paul in general which is here recalled, but a special feature of his life, *his journey* into Asia Minor, when, intending to repair to Rome, he bade the presbyters of those churches the affecting farewells related in the narrative of the Acts, and associated them in some way with the consecration of his martyrdom. The analogy of that moment with the position of Ignatius, when he was writing to the Ephesians, on the way to Rome, is at once obvious. There was no similar comparison to make with the life of John. There is more: in chapter xi. of that same letter, there might well be found an allusion to the

[1] Τίς ὁ σωζόμενος πλούσιος, c. 42 (compare Eusebius, iii. 24).

[2] *Ad Eph.* c. 12.

presence of John at Ephesus: "The Christians of Ephesus," says Ignatius, "have always lived in perfect harmony (*συνήνεσαν*) *with the apostles*, in the strength of Jesus Christ." Let it, moreover, not be forgotten that Ignatius was coming from Syria, and that he had not been acquainted with John in Asia Minor.

As to Polycarp, he wrote regarding Paul to the Philippians (chap. iii.): "Neither I nor any one similar to me could attain to the wisdom of the blessed Paul, who, when he was with you, carefully taught you the word of truth;" then (chap. ix.) he recalls to them the example of patience "which they had seen with their own eyes, not only in Ignatius, but in Paul himself." But, writing to the Philippians, could he thus speak to them of John, whom they had doubtless never either seen or heard? What a difference from Paul, whom they had seen so many times, and Ignatius, who had just visited them on his way to Rome!

The similar objection, derived from the narrative of the death of Polycarp in the acts of his martyrdom by the church of Smyrna, is not more serious. Sixty years had elapsed since John's decease, and yet that church could not have written without making mention of him! Hilgenfeld, moreover, rightly dwelt upon the title of *apostolic teacher* given to Polycarp (chap. xviii.), which recalls his personal relations with one or with several apostles.

But Keim and Scholten find the most decisive argument in the silence of Papias; much more in the express denial of any connection with the apostle, which is contained in his expressions quoted by Eusebius. Irenæus, it is true, did not understand them in the same sense. He believes he can call Papias a *hearer of John* (*Ἰωάννου ἀκουστής*). But, it may be said, that is precisely his mistake, which Eusebius has restored, and which he has rectified by a more thorough study of the terms which Papias employed. The opponents of John's sojourn in Asia naturally lay hold of the interpretation of Eusebius to accuse Irenæus of a want of clearness, either semi-voluntary (Keim) or intentional (Ziegler),[1] and thus to invest his testimony in general regarding the person and Gospel of John with suspicion. The importance of that ques-

[1] Irenæus, 1871.

tion is recognised. Leimbach quotes as many as forty-five writers who have carefully considered it in these latter days. We are obliged to look at it very closely.

Above all, what is the period of Papias, and the date of his writing? Irenæus adds to the title of *hearer of John*, which he gives to him, that of *companion of Polycarp* (Πολυκάρπου ἑταῖρος). That term designates a *contemporary*. Now, the most recent researches place the martyrdom of Polycarp in 155 or 156,[1] and that date seems to be generally adopted at the present time (Renan, Lipsius, Hilgenfeld). As Polycarp himself declares that he had spent eighty-six years in the service of the Lord, we must place his birth at the latest in the year 70. If Papias was his contemporary, he must then have lived between 70 and 160; and if the Apostle John died about the year 100, he might, chronologically speaking, have been in contact with him down to the age of thirty. Irenæus at the same time calls Papias a man of Christian antiquity (ἀρχαῖος ἀνήρ), a quality which Eusebius himself pleads as an excuse for the too great readiness with which Irenæus on his part has welcomed certain teachings. Papias, then, as well as Polycarp, belonged to the generation which immediately succeeded the apostles. Finally, there is in the very fragment we are about to consider an expression which leads us to the same conclusion. Papias says that he acquainted himself with "that which Andrew, then Peter and Philip, etc. etc. etc., *had said* (εἶπεν), and that which Aristion and John the presbyter, the disciples of the Lord, *say* (λέγουσιν)." That opposition between the present *say* and the past *had said* is too marked to be accidental. It implies, as Keim, Hilgenfeld, Mangold at the present day admit, that at the moment when Papias wrote, the two last-named persons were still alive.[2] Now, as that epithet, "*the disciples of the Lord*," can in this context designate only the *personal* disciples of Jesus, on the supposition that they were from fifteen to twenty years old at the

[1] Waddington, *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et des Belles Lettres*, vol. xxvi. 2d part, p. 232 ff.

[2] Zahn and Riggenbach think that this present "*say*" may only designate the permanence of the *testimony* of these men; Leimbach, that it arises from the circumstance that Papias thinks that he still hears them speak.—All that would be possible only in so far as the antithesis with the preceding past tense, *has said*, did not exist.

death of the Lord, they would then have been from eighty-five to ninety about the year 100. At the latest, then, Papias wrote between 100 and 110, when he was already thirty or forty years old.[1] Here is now the fragment quoted by Eusebius,[2] and the question will be to decide whether the personal relation of Papias with John the apostle is *affirmed* (Irenæus) or *excluded* (Eusebius) by the expressions of that Father: "Now I shall not fail to add to my explanations also (*συγκατατάξαι*[3] *ταῖς ἑρμηνείαις*) all that which I have formerly very well learnt, and very well remembered from the elders (*παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*), while guaranteeing to thee the truth thereof. For I did not take pleasure, like the great *mass* of people, in those who relate many things, but in those who teach true things; or in those who spread abroad strange commandments, but in those who spread abroad the commandments given to the faith by the Lord, and which come[4] from the truth itself. And if at times, also, one of those who accompanied the elders came to visit me (*εἰ δέ που καὶ παρακολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἐλθοί*), I used to inquire about the words of the elders (*τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους*); what Andrew or Peter said (*τί Ἀνδρέας ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν*), or Philip, or Thomas, or James, or John,[5] or Matthew, or some other of the disciples of the Lord (*ἢ τὶς ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῶν*); then of *what* Aristion and the Presbyter John, the disciples of the Lord, say (*ἃ τε Ἀριστίων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης, οἱ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταὶ, λέγουσιν*);[6]

[1] One must be resolutely determined to create a history after his own fashion, to place, as Volkmar has ventured to do, the writing of Papias in 165.

[2] *H. E.* iii. 39.

[3] That reading (and not *συντάξαι*) seems certain; see Leimbach.

[4] The ambiguity of our translation reproduces the possible meaning of the two readings (*παραγινομένας* and *παραγινομένοις*), according to which the words "*and which come*" may refer either to the commandments or to the individuals themselves.

[5] M. Renan has proposed to cut off from the text the words *or John*. This is altogether arbitrary; and in that case the conclusion of Eusebius on the existence of a second John would lose its foundation.

[6] Papias here substitutes for the interrogative pronoun *τί* (in the preceding proposition) the relative pronoun *ἅ*, because the idea of interrogation is remote. This *ἅ* is the object of *ἀνέκρινον*, parallel to the preceding object *λόγους* (thus also Holtzmann). No one, I think, would be tempted to accept of Leimbach's translation: or which (*τίς*) of the disciples of the Lord [has narrated] what Aristion or John says? A sufficient refutation lies in the *τί*, placed as it is after

because I did not suppose that that which is taken from books could be as useful to me as that which comes from the living and permanent word [faithfully transmitted]."

There are in this passage two distinct paragraphs, the second of which begins with the words: "*And if at times also.*" Hilgenfeld and others maintain that this second paragraph is only a commentary on the first, and refers to the same fact. But that interpretation does violence to the text. Instead of "*and* if at times," Papias should have said, "*for* when at times." Then the two particles (δέ, *καί, moreover, also*) evidently indicate a gradation, and not an identity. Each paragraph, then, refers to a distinct fact. In the first, Papias speaks of what he had *formerly* learned and remembered *from the elders themselves;* in the second, he makes mention of the information which had since then reached him from the mouth of visitors, who had been the companions of these elders (had accompanied them) in their missionary journeys. That distinction explains the use of the preposition *παρά* [in the first proposition], the regular and ordinary meaning of which is that of direct personal communication, then the addition of the adverb *formerly* (ποτέ), which indicates that the point here concerns a relation long since broken; whilst in the second paragraph, the question is of indirect but more recent communications, by means of persons intermediate between him and the elders. But who are these elders? According to Weiffenbach, one of those writers who have treated the subject most recently and in the greatest detail, they are the presbyters of the churches—disciples of the apostles. Papias would thus form the third link in the chain of tradition. The first would be the apostles; the second, those whom he calls the elders—that is, the *presbyters* established by them; and the third, Papias and his contemporaries. That explanation is not tenable. Why should not Papias, who was in the eyes of Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, a man of Christian antiquity, and who wrote at a time when Aristion and the Presbyter John, immediate disciples of Jesus, were still alive,

ἅ, and not after Ἀριστίων. And is it not evident that the words ἤ τις ἕτερος are the conclusion, and as it were the *et cetera*, of the enumeration? Besides, what does it signify *which* of the disciples has said such and such a thing? Finally, the ellipsis of the verb.

occupy, in the scale of authorities, the same rank as Polycarp? But, especially, how are we to explain the second paragraph in this sense of the word elders? And first, the expression: "Some one *who had accompanied* the elders." They *accompanied* the apostles in their missionary journeys, and it was a title of honour to have filled such an office. The term used (παρακολουθεῖν) is set apart to express that idea. But where is there any question of the title of companion *of the disciples* of the apostles? And how can we speak of the companions of presbyters who did not travel about, and who laboured in a single church? Then there would be no sense, as Leimbach has shown, in the very expression: Some one who had accompanied *the* presbyters. The number of the presbyters or elders of the church was at that period immense. Papias ought then to have said, Who had accompanied *some one* of the presbyters. The article *the* (οἱ) designates a definitive and limited whole, which could only be that of the apostles themselves. In the contrary sense, moreover, to what step would Papias here make himself come down? No longer only to the third, but to the fourth. First step, the apostles; second, their disciples, the elders; third, those who have accompanied the latter, and whose visits Papias received; fourth, Papias himself. He would thus descend below Irenæus, who occupies the third rank (1st, the apostles; 2d, Polycarp; 3d, Irenæus), and who nevertheless regards Papias as one of his fathers—a personage of a high antiquity! What follows is not less decisive. About what did Papias inquire at these accidental visitors? About that which they had heard related by those persons who are named afterwards. And who, then, are those persons? Papias designates them by name. They were Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, etc., or *some other of the disciples of the Lord?* So many apostles and disciples of Jesus, but none of the disciples of those persons! To escape that conclusion, Weiffenbach explains that phrase thus: When a visitor who had accompanied the elders (the presbyters established by the apostles) arrived at my house, I *used to investigate* the words of the elders [to verify] what Andrew, Peter, etc., had said. But in that sense, ought not Papias to have said, I used to investigate the words of the elders on *the subject* of what . . . had said (περὶ τουτῶν ἃ εἶπεν)? According to the expression, the

interrogative phrase—*what has Andrew said?* etc.—is merely the expansion of the preceding expression, the words of the elders. We can imagine that we hear Papias interrogating his visitor: What has Andrew, Peter, etc., related of that which took place—of what Jesus did or said in such circumstances? Then the expression, *the elders*, most certainly includes in the mind of Papias the apostles themselves. But does it include the apostles *merely?* No; for in that case we do not see why Papias should not have said *the apostles*, instead of *the elders*. That latter expression has evidently, in his view, a wider range. It designates *all the immediate disciples of the Lord*, who are not merely the apostles. This is what appears from the following words: "And of what Aristion and John the presbyter, the disciples of the Lord, say." These two persons were not apostles; and, nevertheless, they also were authorities for Papias, because they had seen and heard the Lord. The terminology of Papias is then perfectly comprehensible. What Papias and Polycarp were to Irenæus, a man of the third generation, were the apostles and all the immediate disciples of Jesus to Papias, a man of the second. Thus it is, as Holtzmann has well said, that the title of elder (πρεσβύτερος) is of relative and variable application. Nevertheless the sense of the word remains: a venerated father and teacher, for men of the subsequent generation.

But who, then, is this John *the presbyter*, whom Papias here names along with Aristion, and whom he seems to distinguish from John the apostle, named above between James and Matthew? Zahn and Riggenbach maintain that it is always the same individual, John the apostle, designated under two different relations; the first time, in so far as Papias had communicated with him *indirectly* through the medium of his visitors; the second time, in so far as he had *personally* been his auditor. They consequently deny the existence of a *Presbyter* John distinct from the apostle, and decide against Eusebius as wrong, and in favour of Irenæus as right.[1] But that explanation appears to me incompatible with the first words of the paragraph: "*If at times, also, one of those who had accompanied the elders* came to my house."

[1] Leimbach arrives at a similar conclusion, but by means of the impossible translation which we have noticed above.

That idea of intermediate persons determines the verb, *I sought to find out;* and it is on the latter that all the rest of the sentence as object depends, including in it what is said of Aristion and of the Presbyter John. And consequently, in the *two* phrases of the second paragraph where John is named, the point in question is of an *indirect* communication. The only explanation possible, then, is that Papias speaks of two different persons, one of whom is dead (*what said he*, εἶπεν), John the apostle, and the other still living (what *says he*), John the presbyter. Eusebius is then right on that point; the passage of Papias proves the existence of another John besides the apostle. But is Irenæus necessarily mistaken in asserting (perhaps on the strength of that same passage) that Papias had been a *hearer of the apostle?* By no means. Only we must draw that conclusion, not from the second, but from the first paragraph—I mean from the words, "What I well learnt and remembered *from the elders.*" We have admitted that the apostles were in the first rank of these elders. Now, if there were apostles dwelling in Asia, they could only be Philip and John. Here is the first source from which Papias drew the information on which he supported his explanations of the words of the Lord. It forms the object of the first paragraph. The second refers to another source of an inferior class (*and if, moreover, also*); these are the accounts given to him by certain visitors, who at a later period had conversed with these same apostles, and the last surviving disciples of Jesus (Aristion and the Presbyter John), with whom Papias could no longer communicate directly as he had done long ago in his youth.

In this way everything is clear. Papias drew materials for his explanations from two foreign sources; the one immediate,—*the elders* with whom he communicated at a more remote period; the other, mediate and more recent,—the *visitors* who had communicated with the elders, whether dead (the apostles named) or still alive (Aristion, John the presbyter). That title of *presbyter*, given to John, the companion of Aristion, remains to be explained. That term must undoubtedly be understood here in a technical sense as an ecclesiastical title—*presbyter* or *elder of the church.* As a proof of this, it is not applied to Aristion, to whom, however, it

would have been as suitable as to John, if it had retained the meaning in which it is taken in the preceding pages.[1] If, then, Eusebius has rightly concluded from the passage of Papias that there was a second John, he has been wrong in calling in question, on the strength of that passage, the accuracy of Irenæus, when the latter makes Papias the *hearer* of the Apostle John. And we are not to draw, from that fragment preserved by him, any conclusion opposed to the sojourn of John in Asia Minor. The expressions of Papias, rightly understood, much rather imply this fact, which Eusebius, moreover, never dreamt of denying. The only point of importance to him in his interpretation of Papias, was to prove from that Father himself the existence of a second John, to whose account might be ascribed the composition of the Apocalypse, since he and others no longer regarded it as a strictly apostolic writing.

But—and here is the grand argument of Keim—what if Irenæus was mistaken in alleging that the John known by Polycarp was the apostle, whilst that person was only the presbyter? And what if that error of Irenæus had led all tradition astray? Keim supports this assertion by that expression of Irenæus himself in his letter to Florinus, in which he speaks of his relations with Polycarp, "*When I was still a child*" (παῖς ἔτι ὤν); and by that other similar one in his great work, on the same occasion, "*In our first youth*" (ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικίᾳ). But every one acquainted with the Greek language knows well that such expressions, particularly the term translated by *child* (παῖς), frequently denotes *a young man;*[2] and could a young Christian, already of an age to be a hearer of Polycarp, have confused, in listening to his narratives, a mere presbyter with the Apostle John? Besides, Polycarp went himself to Rome shortly before his martyrdom; he himself appealed in the presence of Anicetus to the apostle's authority in support of the Easter usage of Asia Minor. The misapprehension, if such had existed,

[1] If the two short epistles are by the apostle, and not by the presbyter, it is probable that the former was only called "*the elder*" in an exceptional sense, and without the addition of his proper name.

[2] John is called παῖς by the Fathers at the moment when he became the disciple of Jesus.

would then infallibly have been cleared up. Finally, even had the testimony of Irenæus been founded on a mistake, it could never have had the decisive influence on tradition which is attributed to it. For there exist other statements contemporaneous with his own, and which are necessarily independent of it, like those of Clement in Egypt, and of Polycrates in Asia Minor,—or even prior to his, as those of Apollonius in Asia, of Polycarp at Rome, and of Justin. And consequently it is to attempt an impossibility to make the tradition on that point proceed from Irenæus. Could Irenæus, writing in Gaul about 185, have drawn after him all those writers or witnesses, the chain of whom goes back from 190 to 150, and that in all parts of the world?[1]

Scholten is agreed as to the impossibility of explaining the error in the way which Keim does.[2] He thinks that it arose from the Apocalypse, which was attributed to the Apostle John, and which appeared to have been composed in Asia.[3] Mangold has himself replied with perfect justice, that, on the contrary, it is the certainty of John's sojourn in Asia which could alone have induced the churches of that country to attribute to him the composition of the Apocalypse.[4] If Justin himself, whilst he was sojourning at Ephesus, where he maintained his public dispute with Trypho, had not ascertained the certainty of John's sojourn in that country, how could he ever have dreamt of attributing to him a book, the first chapters of which so evidently imply an Asiatic origin?

Moreover, that tradition was so diffused in all the churches of Asia Minor, that Irenæus says that he knew *several pres-*

[1] Against the testimony of Polycrates has been weighed the error contained in his letter to Victor, in regard to the *deacon* Philip, who, he affirms, was *one of the Twelve*. The hypothesis of Steitz, who considers the words, "who *was one of the seven*," as interpolated in the text of Acts xxi. 8, would overthrow the objection. But in any case there is a great difference between an apostolic man, such as the Evangelist Philip, who plays so important a part in the narrative of the Acts, and who might easily be confounded with the apostle, and a man so obscure as the Presbyter John.

[2] He decides in favour of Steitz, who has proved that the idea of John's sojourn was *already in existence* when Apollonius and Irenæus wrote.

[3] Keim does not entirely reject that explanation. He says, "The Apocalypse came in also 'as a help.'"

[4] Notes in the third edition of Bleek's *Introduction*, p. 168.

byters who, in consideration of their *personal intimacy* with the Apostle John, testified to the authenticity of the number 666, in opposition to the various reading 616. Finally, how is the testimony, comprised in the letter to Florinus, to be set aside? Scholten, it is true, has tried to prove the spuriousness of that document. Hilgenfeld calls that attempt a *desperate undertaking*.[1] We shall add, and a useless one, even if successful; for the letter of Irenæus to Victor, which there is no attempt to dispute, remains, and is sufficient. Besides, nothing can be weaker than the arguments by which Scholten seeks to justify that act of critical violence.[2] There is only one true reason—that which arises from that admission. If the letter was authentic, the personal intimacy of Polycarp with John the apostle could no longer be denied. Well, we may well say, the authenticity of that letter remaining unassailable, from the avowal of Scholten himself, the personal relation of Polycarp with John the apostle cannot be denied.

But it is maintained that, as the Apocalypse supposes the death of all the apostles as an accomplished fact, and that in the year 68,[3] the Apostle John could not still have been alive about the year 100. And what, then, are the words of the Apocalypse, from which the death of all the apostles is inferred? Here they are (according to the text now verified), xviii. 20: "Rejoice, thou heaven, and ye saints and apostles and prophets (*οἱ ἅγιοι καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ προφῆται*), for God hath taken upon the earth the vengeance due to you." . . . That passage assuredly proves that at the date of the composition of the Apocalypse there were in heaven some saints, apostles, and prophets who had suffered martyrdom.

But "some apostles" are not *all* the apostles, any more than "some saints" are *all* the saints![4] There thus disappear the objections which theological prejudices have called forth

[1] *Einleitung*, p. 397.

[2] Thus he asks how Eusebius obtained that letter; how the relation of Polycarp with John is compatible with his death in 168 (we should say 156); why Irenæus does not recall to Florinus his title of presbyter to the Romish Church? and other arguments of similar strength.

[3] We do not here discuss that alleged date of the Apocalypse; we believe that we have elsewhere demonstrated its falsity. *Etudes bibliques*, vol. ii. 5th study.

[4] For the objection taken from the narrative of the martyrdom of John by the Jews in the chronicle of Georgius Hamartôlos, see p. 77 ff.

against the historical fact, unanimously authenticated, of John's sojourn in Asia.[1]

Tradition attests not only in a general manner John's sojourn in Asia; it likewise relates many individual features, which, whilst they may indeed have been magnified, cannot at the same time be altogether inventions. In each case these anecdotes imply a well-founded conviction of the reality of that sojourn.

There is, for instance, the meeting of John with the heretic Cerinthus in a public bath at Ephesus. "People are still living," says Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.* iii. 3. 4), "who have heard Polycarp relate that John, having entered a bath-house at Ephesus, and having seen Cerinthus inside, went away abruptly, without having taken a bath, saying: 'Let us get out, in case the house falls down, since it contains Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth.'" That well-authenticated trait recalls the susceptibility to impression of the young apostle, who refused the right of healing in the name of Jesus to that believer who did not outwardly walk with the apostles, or who requested that fire from heaven might come down on the Samaritan village which showed a hostile feeling to Jesus. Or, again, it is the feature, narrated by Clement of Alexandria, of the young man whom John had entrusted to a bishop of Asia Minor, and whom the aged apostle succeeded in reclaiming from the criminal path on which he had entered. That act recalls the fervent love of the young heart, which at its first meeting with Jesus gave itself entirely up to Him, and thus became the disciple whom Jesus loved.[2]

[1] In no question, perhaps, do we more distinctly perceive the decisive influence of the will over the appreciation of facts. Hilgenfeld, Baur's disciple, and Baur himself, have need of John's sojourn in Asia. It forms the basis of their argument against the Authenticity of our Gospel, derived from the Apocalypse and the Easter controversy. What happens? They find the witnesses who attest that fact perfectly convincing. But Keim, for whom that sojourn is too embarrassing a fact (since the remote date which he assigns to the composition of our Gospel would bring it too near to the time of that sojourn), declares all the witnesses who attest it to be without value. What are we to think after this of the much vaunted objectivity of historico-critical studies? No. It is too often opinions which make facts, and not facts which form the foundation of opinions. Under every critical judgment there is a feeling of sympathy or antipathy which warps the understanding.

[2] Here is that fact, loaded with the rhetorical amplifications of Clement, as

Clement says that the apostle returned from Patmos to Ephesus after the death of the tyrant. Tertullian (*de prescript. Hær.* 36) states that that exile was preceded by a journey to Rome, and adds the following details: "After the apostle had been immersed in the oil, and had come out of it safe and sound, he was banished to an island." According to

related in *Quis dives salvus*: "Listen to what is related (and it is not a tale, but a true history) of the Apostle John. When he was returning from Patmos to Ephesus, after the tyrant's death, he visited the surrounding countries, to establish bishops and found churches. One day in a town near Ephesus, after having exhorted the brethren and settled matters, he saw a sprightly and handsome young man, to whom he felt himself immediately attracted; whereupon he said to the bishop: 'I place him on thy heart, and on that of the church.' The bishop promised to the apostle to take care of him. He received him into his house, instructed and watched over him till he could admit him to be baptized. But after he had received the seal of the Lord, the bishop relaxed in his vigilance. The young man, too soon left to himself, frequented bad company, abandoned himself to all kinds of excess, and ended by stopping and robbing passengers on the highway. Like a mettlesome horse, which, when it has once left the path, rushes blindly down the precipice; so, carried away by his natural disposition, he plunged into the abyss of perdition. Henceforth despairing of pardon, he wished at least to do something great in that life of crime. He assembled his dissolute companions, formed them into a band of brigands, of whom he became the chief, and soon surpassed them all in his thirst for blood and violence. After a certain lapse of time, John returned to the same town; having finished all he had to do there, he asked the bishop: 'Well! now restore the pledge which the Lord and I have entrusted to thee in the presence of the church.' The latter, terrified, imagined that he alluded to a sum of money which had been confided to him. 'Not at all,' replied John, 'but the young man, the soul of thy brother!' The old man sighed, and, bursting into tears, answered, 'He is dead!' 'Dead!' replied the disciple of the Lord; 'and by what kind of death?' 'Dead to God! He became an infidel, then a robber. He lives with his companions on the top of that mountain.' On hearing these words, the apostle rent his garments, smote his head, and cried, 'Oh, to what a guardian have I entrusted the soul of my brother!' He took a horse and a guide and went straight to the place where the robbers were. He was seized by the sentinels; and very far from trying to escape, he said: 'It is for that purpose that I have come, lead me to your chief.' The latter, fully armed, awaited his arrival. But as soon as he recognised in the new-comer the Apostle John, he took to flight. John, forgetful of his age, ran after him, crying: 'Oh my son, why dost thou fly from me, thy father? Thou an armed man—I, an old defenceless one? Have pity upon me! My son, do not fear! There is still hope of life for thee. I wish myself to take the burden of all before Christ. If it is necessary, I will die for thee, as Christ died for us. Stop! Believe! It is Christ who sends me.' The youth on hearing those words stops, with downcast looks. Then he throws away his arms, and begins to tremble and to weep bitterly. And when the old man comes up, he embraces his knees and begs forgiveness with deep

Irenæus, it would appear that that tyrant was Domitian.[1] Some learned men maintain that this idea of a punishment undergone by John is to be found in the epithet of *witness* (or *martyr*) bestowed on John by Polycrates. But is there not perhaps in that narrative a fiction, having a merely imaginary foundation, based on those words addressed by Jesus to the two sons of Zebedee: "You shall be baptized with the baptism wherewith I must be baptized,"—words the literal realization of which is sought in vain in the life of John? As to the exile at Patmos, we might likewise imagine that that narrative is only an inference from Apoc. i. Nevertheless Eusebius says: "*Tradition declares*" (λόγος ἔχει); and as history proves the reality of exiles of that kind under Domitian, and that precisely for the crime of professing the Christian faith,[2] there might well be more there than an exegetical combination. That banishment and the composition of the Apocalypse are placed by Epiphanius under the reign of Claudius (from the year 41 to the year 54). That date is positively absurd, since at that period the churches of Asia Minor, to which the Apocalypse is addressed, did not exist. M. Renan (*The Antichrist*, p. 27 ff.) has supposed that the legend of John's martyrdom might have arisen from the fact that that apostle is said to have undergone a sentence at Rome at the same time as Peter and Paul. That hypothesis is not sufficiently supported. According to the anti-Montanist writer Apollonius, about 180, John is said to have raised a dead man at Ephesus (Eusebius, v. 18). Augustine speaks of a cup of poison which he himself is said to have drunk without experiencing any injury from it; perhaps these two legends have reference to Matt. x. 8 and Mark xvi. 18.

Clement of Alexandria describes the ministry of edification and organization which was exercised by the apostle in Asia.

groans; those tears are for him a second baptism, only he refuses and still conceals his right hand. The apostle, becoming surety for him before the Lord, with an oath promises him pardon, kneels down, prays, and finally taking him by that hand which he holds back, he conducts him back to the church, and there combats so fervently and so mightily by fasting and by his addresses, that at length he is able to restore him to the flock as an example of true regeneration."

[1] For in *Adv. Hær.* v. 33 he places the composition of the Apocalypse under Domitian.

[2] *H. E.* iii. 18.

He visited the churches, appointed bishops, and regulated affairs. Rothe, Thiersch, Neander himself,[1] attribute to the influence exercised by him the stable constitution of the churches of Asia Minor during the second century, the first traces of which we already find in the Apocalypse (the *angel* of the church), and a little later in the letters of Ignatius. History then demonstrates that these churches were visited by an apostle such as John, capable of crowning the edifice erected by Paul. But the noblest monument of the visit of John to those countries, is the maturity of faith and Christian life to which the churches of Asia were exalted. Polycrates, in his enthusiastic language, represents St. John to us at that period of his life as the high priest, who bore on his forehead the plate of gold with the inscription: Holiness to the Lord. "John," he says, "who rested on the bosom of the Lord, and who became the priest bearing the plate of gold, both witness and teacher." An effort has been made to render that passage absurd, by taking it in a literal sense; but the meaning of the aged bishop is evident. John, the last survivor of the apostolate, had left on the church of Asia the impression of a pontiff from whose forehead shone the spiritual splendour of the holiness of Christ. Perhaps, in this description of the apostle, Polycrates alludes to the three principal books which were attributed to him; by the title of *priest* wearing the sacerdotal fillet, to the Apocalypse; by that of *witness*, to the Gospel; finally, by that of *teacher*, to the Epistle.

The hour for work had sounded in the first place for Simon Peter. He had founded the church in Israel, and planted the standard of the new covenant on the ruins of the theocracy. Paul had followed: his task had been to liberate the church from the restrictions of expiring Judaism, and to open the door of the kingdom of God to the Gentiles. Then, finally, the hour sounded for John—for him who had been the first disciple, and whom his Master reserved to be the last: he completed the fusion of those heterogeneous elements, and conducted the church to the comparative perfection of which it was then susceptible. According to all the traditions,[2] John

[1] *Geschichte der Pflanzung der christlichen Kirche*, book ii. p. 430.

[2] Tertullian, *De monogamia*, xvii.; Ambrosiaster on 2 Cor. xi. 2: "All the apostles, except John and Paul, were married."

never had any other spouse than the church of the Lord, nor any other family than that which he salutes in his Epistles by the title of "*My children.*" From thence the epithet of *virginal* (ὁ παρθένιος), by which he was frequently designated (Epiphanius and Augustine). We find in the writings of John Cassian an anecdote which well describes the remembrance which he left behind him in Asia.[1]

V.

THE DEATH OF ST. JOHN.

All the statements of the Fathers relative to the last days of John agree on that point, that his life was prolonged to the verge of extreme old age.

Jerome (*Ep. to the Gal.* vi. 10) relates that, having reached the most advanced age, and being too weak to be able still to repair to the assemblies of the church, he made the young men carry him thither; and having no longer strength to speak much, he contented himself with saying: "My little children, love one another." And when he was asked why he always repeated that single word, his answer was, "Because that is the Lord's command; and if that is done, enough is done." According to the same Jerome, he died, prostrated with old age, sixty-eight years after the Passion of the Lord,—that is to say, about the year 100. Irenæus says that "he lived even till the time of Trajan,"—that is to say, even after the year 98. According to Suidas, he is said to have even attained the age of 120. The letter of Polycrates proves that he was buried at Ephesus (οὗτος ἐν Ἐφέσῳ

[1] We transcribe it from Hilgenfeld's *Introduction*, p. 405: "It is related that the blessed Evangelist John was one day gently caressing a partridge, and that a young man, returning from hunting, seeing him thus employed, asked him in amazement how so illustrious a man could give himself up to so trifling an occupation? 'What dost thou carry in thy hand?' replied John. 'A bow,' said the youth. 'Why is it not bent as usual?' 'Not to take from it by bending it too often the elasticity which it should possess at the moment when I shall shoot forth my arrow?' 'Do not be shocked then, young man, at that brief solace which we allow to our mind, which otherwise losing its spring could not assist us when necessity requires it.'" This trait is in any case a testimony to the calm and serene impression which the old age of John had left on the church.

κεκοίμηται). In that town two tombs were likewise shown, one of which must have been that of the apostle (Eusebius, *H. E.* vii. 25; Jerome, *de vir. ill.* c. 9), and it is by means of that fact that Eusebius endeavours to establish the hypothesis of a second John, called *the presbyter*, a contemporary of the apostle. The idea had been likewise conceived, that John would be exempted from the necessity of paying the common tribute to death. Those words were quoted which Jesus had addressed to him (John xxi. 22), "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" And we learn from St. Augustine that even his death itself did not dissipate that strange idea. In treatise 124 on St. John's Gospel, he relates that, according to several, the apostle was still alive, sleeping peacefully in his grave; proof of which was furnished by the earth being gently stirred by his breath. Isidore of Seville[1] narrates that, having felt that the day of his departure had come, John caused his grave to be dug, and bidding farewell to his brethren, he laid himself down in it as in a bed, which has made several to allege that he is still alive. They have gone yet further, and have maintained that he was taken up to heaven, like Enoch and Elias.[2]

A more important fact would be that which is narrated in a fragment of the chronicle of Georgius Hamartôlos (ninth century), published by Nolte.[3] After Domitian, Nerva reigned for one year, who, having recalled John from the island, permitted him to reside at Ephesus (ἀπέλυσεν οἰκεῖν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ). Being left the sole survivor among the twelve disciples, after having composed his Gospel, he was considered worthy of martyrdom; for Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, who was witness of the deed (αὐτόπτης τούτου γενόμενος), relates in the second book of the *Lord's discourses* that he was killed by the Jews (ὅτι ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἀνηρέθη); thus fulfilling, as well as his brother, the words which Christ had spoken concerning him, "You shall drink of the cup which I must drink." And the learned Origen also, in his explanation of Matthew, affirms that John thus underwent martyrdom. Keim

[1] *De ortu et obitu patrum*, 71.

[2] Hilgenfeld quotes as a proof, pseudo-Hippolytus, Ephraem of Antioch, and the *Acta Johannis* in the collection of apocryphal Acts, published by Tischendorf, 1851.

[3] *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1862.

and Holtzmann, immediately regarding that fact as authenticated, and placing it without hesitation in Palestine, because *the Jews* are spoken of, have drawn from that an *unanswerable* argument against the sojourn of John in Asia Minor.[1] That proceeding only proves one thing: how credulous science itself is in regard to what it desires. And, first of all, were there not then at Ephesus also Jews capable of killing the apostle?[2] Then, does not the fragment itself place the scene in Asia: "Nerva permitted John to return to Ephesus." Still more, it is as having been a *witness* of the scene that Papias must have narrated it. Did Papias live in Palestine? Finally, let us suppose that this account had displeased our critics, and been in opposition to their system, they might well have asked in that case how, if the work of Papias had really contained that passage, none of the Fathers who had had that work in their hands should have been acquainted with that alleged martyrdom of John, and have made mention of it? They would tell us that the quotation which Hamartôlos makes from Origen is entirely false; that that Father relates, indeed, the banishment to Patmos, but nothing further, etc. etc. And their criticism in that case would be well founded. All unprejudiced learned men have in reality admitted that the chronologist has had a false Papias, or an interpolated Papias, in his hands. But, at all events, if we accept that feature of the narrative: *killed by the Jews*, it would only be logical to see in the testimony rendered to that fact by Papias as *an eye-witness*, an unanswerable proof of the personal relation which had existed between Papias and the apostle in Asia Minor. And MM. Keim and Holtzmann find means of seeing in it the opposite!

To conclude: Supposing that John was 20–25 years old when he was called by Jesus, about the year 30, he would have been 90–95 about the year 100. There is nothing improbable in that. He might well then have had personal

[1] Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, 3d ed. vol. i. p. 42: "A newly-discovered witness, *which puts an end to all illusions.*"

[2] Those who have visited the tomb of Polycarp at Smyrna, and have been received with a shower of stones from the hands of the Jewish children while passing through the Jewish quarter, know something of the fanaticism of the Jews of Asia Minor at the present day. What was it then?

relations with the Polycarps, the Papiases, born about the year 70, and with many other presbyters younger still, who, as Irenæus says, *have seen him face to face* whilst he lived in Asia down till the reign of Trajan.

VI.

CHARACTERISTICS OF JOHN.

Ardour of affection, richness of intuition: such seem to have been, from the point of view of feeling and of intelligence, the two marked features of John's nature. And what a close alliance is that which must have been formed in the presence of Jesus between these two tendencies of his character! Whilst he loved, he was contemplative; and the more he reflected, the more he loved. He was absorbed in that view of love, and from it he derived his inner life. At a later period also he would not analyze the object of his faith like St. Paul. John does not argue; he "affirms," says M. de Pressensé. He would content himself by stating the truth, so that every one who loves it may receive the truth as he himself received it, by way of intuition and not of demonstration. To the Apostle John may be applied in the highest degree what M. Renan has said of the Semite, "He proceeds by intuition, not by deduction." At one bound, the heart of John had raised itself to the dazzling height where faith is enthroned. Henceforth, victory seemed to him perfected, completed: "He who is born of God doth not commit sin." He set up the ideal as the true reality, since he saw it realized in Him whom He loved and possessed. It was St. Paul who received the task of studying and of tracing out the path by which the greater number have to climb step by step the ascent which conducts to that height. In the eyes of John, it is not for the absolute, which is apprehended by faith, to descend to the level of the miseries of experience. The latter must raise itself, at each moment, to the height of the absolute, contemplated from within.

Peter distinguished himself by the practical initiative, which is not very compatible with tender receptivity. Paul united to energy and practical management the penetrating vigour of

an unparalleled dialectic. For although a Semite, he had spent his earliest years in one of the most brilliant centres of Hellenic culture, and had there appropriated the acute forms of the Western spirit. John differed entirely from both. He had never, like Peter, laid the foundation of Christian work; he had never, like Paul, wrestled with dialectic keenness against Judaism, and composed an Epistle to the Galatians or to the Romans. But in the last times of the apostolic age, it was he who celebrated the triumph of the church, founded by Peter and emancipated by Paul. It was he who bequeathed to the world in his three works the threefold picture of the life in God: in the person of Christ (the Gospel), in the Christian (the Epistle), and in the Church (the Apocalypse). He anticipated more perfectly than any other the festival of the eternal life.

BOOK SECOND.

ANALYSIS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

BIEDERMANN, in his *Christian Dogmatics* (p. 254), calls the fourth Gospel the *most wonderful of all religious works.* And he adds: "From one end of that work to the other, the most profound Christian truth and the most fantastic monstrosities meet, not only with one another, but in each other." That judgment cannot cause surprise, coming from a pantheistic theologian. But what does astonish, and is worth the trouble of being noted, is that expression: *The most profound religious truth.* The divine *truth* in that remarkable book must be set forth with truly irresistible evidence to have extorted such a confession.

CHAPTER I.

ANALYSIS.

We do not here intend to discuss the different plans of the Johannine narrative which have been proposed by the commentators. We shall merely indicate that which has been made clear to us from the attentive study of the book itself.

I. The narration is preceded by a *preamble,* which all interpreters almost unanimously admit comprises the first eighteen verses of the first chapter. The author sets forth in that introduction the supreme grandeur and importance of the fact he is about to relate. That fact is nothing less than the

appearance of the perfect revealer of God, and the communication of eternal life to mankind. To reject the *Word made flesh*, is the greatest crime and the greatest misfortune, as is seen from the example of the Jews; to welcome Him is to know and enjoy God, as is proved by the unanimous experience of Jewish and heathen believers. Three aspects of the evangelical fact are then set forth in that prologue. 1st. The creative and revealing *Word*, which is the agent of the divine work; 2d. The rejection of that Word, by the internal act of *unbelief*; 3d. Its acceptation by the moral act of *faith*. The first of these three ideas predominates in vv. 1–5; the second, in vv. 6–11; the third, in vv. 12–18.

In the mind of the author, these are evidently the three aspects under which the history which is about to follow will be presented. We must not, however, regard them as of equal importance. The primordial and permanent fact in that history is the work of the Word. On that basis the two human facts appear and detach themselves, unbelief and faith, the manifestations of which alternate and determine the phases of the narrative.

II. The narrative begins with the account of three days, i. 19–42, which played a decisive part in the work of the Son of God on earth, as well as in the life of the evangelist, if it is true, as the greater number of interpreters admit, that the anonymous companion of Andrew, in ver. 35 and following verses, is none other than the author himself.

On the first day, John the Baptist proclaims before an official deputation of the Sanhedrim the exciting fact of the actual presence of the Messiah in the midst of the people. John himself already recognises Him: "There standeth one among you whom *ye* know not" (ver. 26). The following day he points Him out, in the person of Jesus, to two of his disciples; and on the third day, finally, he lays so much stress on that declaration, that the two disciples resolve to follow Jesus. From that day they recognise His Messianic dignity. Andrew brings his brother Simon to Jesus, and a slight indication, i. 42 (see the exegesis), seems to indicate that the other disciple likewise brought his brother (James the brother of John). Here is formed the first nucleus of the society of

believers. Henceforth it goes on increasing from moment to moment.

There follow anew three days (i. 43–ii. 11), the first and last of which result in adding, the one, two new believers, Philip and Nathanael, to the three or four preceding: the other, that of the marriage feast of Cana, to confirm the growing faith of all. Thus faith, called forth by the testimony of the forerunner, and by the contact of the first comers with Jesus, then spread abroad by the testimony of the latter, is confirmed by the sight of the glory of Jesus (ii. 11),—that is to say, by His power employed in the service of His love.

The return of Jesus to Galilee, mentioned in this portion (i. 43–ii. 1), is followed by an important fact: the removal of the Galilean home of Jesus (ii. 12); with all His family (His mother and His brethren) He quits Nazareth and establishes Himself at Capernaum. Doubtless the disciples also return to the bosom of their families, and resume their previous occupations.

But the feast of the Passover is at hand. The time has come for Jesus to make a first attempt to establish His Messianic work in the residence of the Theocracy at Jerusalem (ii. 13–22). His disciples henceforth constantly accompany Him (ver. 17). By the purification of the temple, He addresses a significant appeal to the Jewish conscience; He invites the people and their rulers to undertake with Him the spiritual elevation of the Theocracy. If the people responded to that signal, all was gained. But instead of yielding itself to the divine appeal, it remains cold. There is the sign of a secret hostility. The triumph of unbelief is, as it were, decided in Israel. Jesus discerns and reveals all the importance of that moment (ver. 19). Nevertheless, some symptoms of faith shine forth in face of that nascent opposition (ii. 23–iii. 21); but that faith is mingled with a carnal alloy. It is as a *doer of miracles* that Jesus attracts attention. The most remarkable instance of that faith which is not *the faith*, is presented in the person of Nicodemus, a Pharisee and member of the Sanhedrim. Along with several of his colleagues, he recognises, like all the other believers in the capital, the divine mission of Jesus, attested by His miraculous

works (iii. 2). Jesus seeks to raise him to a purer apprehension of the person and work of the Messiah than that which he has imbibed from Pharisaical teaching. He dismisses him with that farewell, full of promises (ver. 21): "He that doeth truth cometh to the light." The conclusion of the narrative will correspond with that word of affectionate encouragement (comp. vii. 50 ff., xix. 39 ff.).[1] These few traces of faith, however, do not counterbalance the grand fact of the national unbelief which makes itself more marked. And that tragical fact is the subject of a last discourse of John the Baptist (iii. 22–36). Jesus baptizes in Judea, in the vicinity of His forerunner. The latter profits by that proximity to proclaim Him the bridegroom of Israel—whilst he himself is only the friend of the bridegroom. Then, in face of the general indifference of the people and their rulers towards this Messiah, John pronounces a final threat; it is the echo of the thunders of Sinai, the last word of the Old Testament, ver. 36: "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him."

On the occasion of the two ministries, thus contemporary for the moment, the evangelist makes a remark which astonishes us. "For John," says he, ver. 24, "was not yet cast into prison." Nothing at all in the preceding narrative could have given rise to the idea that John was already apprehended. Why then this explanation without a motive? The author evidently wishes to rectify an error, proceeding from some other narrative with which he supposes his readers to be acquainted; comp. Matt. iv. 12; Mark i. 14.[2]

With that unbelief which is beginning to declare itself in the mass of the nation, and with that faith so defective in some, there contrasts the joyful spectacle of an entire town which had become converted, and that almost without the aid of any supernatural manifestation. But that town is found in Samaria, beyond the territory of Israel (iv. 1–42). It is like a prelude to the future conversion of the Gentiles. Jesus

[1] We see how far Hilgenfeld is deceived in seeing in Nicodemus the representative of the inability of the Jewish conscience to rise to the conception of the Christian belief.

[2] "When Jesus heard that John was cast into prison, He departed into Galilee." "After that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee."

returns for the second time into Galilee (iv. 43–54). There He doubtless received from His fellow-countrymen a more favourable welcome than had been accorded to Him in Judea, for they felt themselves honoured by the impression which their fellow-citizen had produced in the capital. But it is always the worker of miracles, the *wonder-worker*, whom they salute in Him. As an instance, there is related the cure of the son of the nobleman, who came from Capernaum to Galilee on the first announcement of the arrival of Jesus. Here again, in the final remark, ver. 54, there comes out the intention of combating a false notion, which the preceding narrative could not have occasioned. It is the confusion between that second return to Galilee and that which had been previously related. The author shows the difference between these two arrivals, by distinguishing the two miracles, both wrought in Cana, which signalized them. Whence proceeded the confusion which he strives to rectify in the mind of his readers? The answer is easy. From our three Synoptics: comp., besides the passage already quoted, Luke iv. 14 (with all the context which precedes and which follows).

Up till now, the work of Jesus had been extended in succession to all parts of the Holy Land, and that work called forth various manifestations,—either of true faith having a spiritual character, as among the disciples and the inhabitants of Sychar; or of faith mingled with a carnal alloy, as among the believers of Jerusalem and of Galilee; or, finally, of indifference and unbelief, as at Jerusalem and in Judea,—that is to say, in the nation, properly speaking, and amongst its rulers. We believe that it is in accordance with the intention of the evangelist to make here, at the end of the fourth chapter, a halt in the narrative. Under the increasing influence of the work of Jesus there have arisen several manifestations of faith and unbelief, but without a very decided character, and from which there is as yet no positive result. It is a period of preparation, in which all the moral phenomena, called forth by the presence of the divine representative, proclaim themselves without being distinctly marked. From the fifth chapter a change comes into operation. The general movement declares itself, especially at Jerusalem, in the direction of unbelief. It reaches its provisional limit at the close of the twelfth chapter, when the

author, casting a look backwards, inquires into the causes, and points out its tragical importance. Such is, then, the third part of the book, the second of the narrative.

III. The development of the national unbelief (chap. v.–xii.). At the very beginning of chap. iv. mention is made of a report which had reached the Pharisees concerning the activity of Jesus, which was even eclipsing that of John the Baptist. It was that report, conceived in an evidently malevolent spirit, and the echo of which had come to the ears of Jesus, which decided His second return to Galilee. "When, therefore, the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard . . . He left Judea" . . . (iv. 1, 3). Nevertheless, from chap. v. we find Jesus again at Jerusalem. He had wished to make a new attempt in that capital. On that account He had taken advantage of one of the national feasts,—probably that of Purim, a month before the Passover,—and perhaps His intention was to prolong His sojourn, if possible, down to that latter feast. But the cure of the impotent man on the Sabbath day furnished an opportunity for the explosion of concealed hatred; and when Jesus justifies Himself by urging the work of salvation which His Father is working, and which had not yet reached its limit, and at which He ought consequently to labour incessantly, their indignation knew no bounds; He is accused of blasphemy for making Himself equal with God. Jesus defends Himself, by showing that that pretension to equality with God, with which He is upbraided, amounts simply to the most profound dependence on His part on the Father. He then quotes, in support of the testimony which He thus bears to Himself, not only the witness of John the Baptist, but above all that of the Father,—first, in the miraculous works which He gives Him to accomplish; next, in the Scriptures, especially in the writings of that Moses in whose name they accuse Him. By that defence, which the miracle He had performed rendered unanswerable, He escapes immediate danger; but He is obliged to leave Judea again, which for a long time remains closed against Him. In chap. vi. we find Him, then, again in Galilee. The Passover is nigh (ver. 4). Jesus cannot go and keep it at Jerusalem. But God has reserved for Him, as well as for His disciples, an equivalent

in Galilee. With them He repairs to a desert place; the multitudes follow Him thither; and after having compassionately welcomed them, He extemporizes for them a divine banquet (the multiplication of the loaves). The people become excited; but what kind of enthusiasm! It is not the hunger and thirst after righteousness,—it is the expectation of the enjoyments and grandeur of the Messianic kingdom, they desire to *make Him a king* (vi. 15). Jesus perceives the danger which this political turn of affairs is preparing for His work. Well aware that His apostles are not free from that carnal spirit, and that even the focus of that movement can be found among many of them, He hastens to isolate them by making them recross the sea. He Himself remains alone with the multitude to quiet them; and after having anew commended His work to the Father, He rejoins, by walking on the sea, His disciples, who are struggling against the wind; and the day following, in the synagogue of Capernaum, where the people rejoin Him, He speaks so as to make them understand that He is by no means the Messiah whom they seek, but the "bread from heaven" designed to nourish souls which are spiritually hungry. He pushes His opposition to the common ideas to such an extent, that almost the whole of His Galilean adherents break off from Him; and not content with that purification, He desires even that it should penetrate into the circle of the Twelve, and tells them that they are at liberty to withdraw. It was to Judas, the representative of the false Messianic principle in the midst of the Twelve, that Jesus, full of compassion, thus opened the door, as the evangelist remarks in bringing that incomparable narrative to a conclusion.

Summer passes; the feast of Tabernacles is at hand. Jesus has an interview with His brethren, who are astonished that, having already neglected the two feasts of the Passover and of Pentecost, He does not intend to repair to the latter. He answers them, that the time of His public manifestation as the Messiah is not yet come. That moment will undoubtedly be that of His death; now His task is not yet accomplished. Nevertheless, He repairs to Jerusalem, "as it were in secret," and about the middle of the feast, in order to take the rulers by surprise, and not allow them time to take measures against

Him. On the last and great day of the feast, He declares that He Himself is the reality of the typical rock whose waters quenched in the desert the thirst of the fainting people. Lively discussions arose regarding Him amongst His hearers. At every word which He utters He is interrupted in some way by His adversaries; and whilst one part of His audience recognises in Him a prophet, and some even declare that He is the Christ, He reproaches others with acting under the inspiration of him who is a liar and a murderer from the beginning. All these discourses, which fill chap. vii. and viii., are summed up, as He Himself says, in these two words: *judgment* and *testimony;* judgment on the moral condition of the people, witness rendered to His own Messianic and divine character. A first judicial measure is taken against Him. Officers are sent to apprehend Him (vii. 32). But, arrested by the power of His word over their conscience, and by that of public opinion, which is still too favourable to Jesus, they return without having laid hands on Him (ver. 45). The rulers then take a decisive step. They declared that whoever recognised Jesus as the Messiah should be put out of the synagogue (comp. ix. 22). As a consequence of one of His sayings which appeared blasphemous: "Before Abraham was, I am" (viii. 58), a first attempt was made to stone Him.

Chap. ix. also belongs to that sojourn at the feast of Tabernacles. Another miracle on the Sabbath day, the cure of the man who was born blind, exasperates the rulers. According to the Sabbatical law, that miracle *can* not, *ought* not, to take place. The blind man reasons in an inverse manner: the miracle *is;* therefore the Sabbath has not been broken. That fruitless controversy terminates in the forcible expulsion of the blind man. Jesus directs the look of that soul to faith in His divine character, and whilst announcing the selection which is now at work amongst the ignorant of low degree,—the *blind,* who receive their sight, and the proud and learned, the *seeing,* who become blind,—He receives the blind man, doubly cured, into His fold. Farther on, chap. x., He describes Himself as the divine Shepherd, who brings His own sheep from the ancient theocratic sheepfold in order to give them life, whilst the greater part of the flock is led to slaughter by those who had usurped authority over it.

He next announces the incorporation into His flock of new sheep coming from other folds (ver. 16). On hearing these words, a still more marked division takes place among the people, between His adversaries and His partisans (vv. 19–21).

Three months elapse: the evangelist does not tell us how they have been spent. The supposition is inadmissible, that in the condition in which matters stood, Jesus had spent all that time in Jerusalem, or even in Judea,—He who, previous to all those scenes, could only reappear at Jerusalem secretly. In the end of December, Jesus repairs to the feast of Dedication (x. 22–39). The Jews surround Him, determined to wrest from Him the great avowal: "Tell us if thou art the Christ?" Jesus, as always, affirms the thing, while avoiding the expression of it. He lays emphasis on His perfect unity with the Father, which necessarily implies His Messianic character. His adversaries are already taking up stones to stone Him. Jesus causes them to fall from their hands by this question (ver. 32): "Many good works have I showed you from my Father. For which of these works do ye stone me?" He well knew that it was His two preceding miracles (chap. v. and ix.) which had made their hatred overflow. He then appeals, against the accusation of blasphemy, to the divine character attributed by the Old Testament itself to the theocratic authorities, which should have led Israel to believe in the divinity of the supreme ambassador—the Messiah. From Jerusalem, Jesus repairs to Perea, into the countries where John had baptized; and there He accomplishes His work in that country which had been the cradle of it (x. 40–42).

It is there that He receives the summons from the sisters of Lazarus (chap. xi.). We are surprised to see (ver. 1) Bethany designated as *the town of Mary and Martha*. These two persons, not having yet been mentioned in the narrative, how can they serve to enable the reader to understand his position? We must here again admit that the author alludes to other narratives with which he supposes his readers to be acquainted (comp. Luke x. 38–42; then also John xi. 2 with Matt. xxvi. 6–13 and Mark xiv. 3–9). The miracle of the resurrection of Lazarus forms the consummation of that for which the two preceding had prepared the way. It brings the

plans of the enemies of Jesus to maturity. Acting on the suggestion of Caiaphas (xi. 49, 50), the Sanhedrim determines to get rid of the impostor. And whilst Jesus withdraws towards the north, to the neighbourhood of the solitary hamlet of Ephraim, the rulers at last take their first public measure against Him. They publish an order to every Israelite to show where Jesus might be found (ver. 57). Then, perhaps, the first thought of treachery sprung up in the heart of Judas. Soon after, indeed six days before the Passover, Jesus set out for Jerusalem, and halted at Bethany. There, at a banquet which was offered to Him by His friends, burst forth, for the ear of Jesus, the secret hatred of Judas (xii. 4, 5). The next day, the royal entry of Jesus into the capital fulfilled the desire which His brethren had expressed six months previously. The day had arrived. The resurrection of Lazarus had excited in the highest degree the enthusiasm of the pilgrims who had come to the feast; the rulers were, as it were, paralysed, and took no action. Thus was accomplished that Messianic act by which Jesus, once at least, publicly said to Israel: "Behold thy King," but by which also the fury of His adversaries was urged to extremity (xii. 9–19). The resurrection of Lazarus, and the public homage which it called forth, were the two proximate causes of the catastrophe which had been long ago prepared. Jesus was not ignorant of what was going on; nor was He indifferent to it. The opportunity was given Him of expressing, even in the temple, what was passing in His heart in those days when He saw the end approaching. Certain Greeks desired to speak to Him (ver. 20). Like an instrument whose tightly stretched strings become sonorous at the first contact of the bow, His soul responded to that appeal. The Greeks? Yes, the Gentile world is about to open, and the power of Satan to give place, in that vast domain, to that of the divine Monarch. But words will not be enough for that great work; death will be necessary. It is from the height of the instrument of punishment that Jesus will draw all men after Him. And what anguish does not that prospect cause Him! His soul is moved, even *troubled* by it. John alone has preserved the account of that exceptional hour. It was the close of His public ministry. After having once more invited the Jews to believe in the Light which was about to

be concealed, "He departed, and did hide Himself from them" (ver. 36).

Having arrived at that moment, the evangelist casts a glance backward on the path which has been traversed—the ministry of Jesus in Israel. The unbelief of the Jews has resisted all the miracles, great and numerous as they have been (ver. 37), all the instruction, solemn and precise as it could possibly be (vv. 44–58).[1]

Nevertheless, in the midst of that universal blindness, divine light had penetrated into many hearts, even among the members of the Sanhedrim, and fear alone of the Pharisees prevented them from confessing their faith (ver. 42). And, indeed, the element of faith is not entirely wanting in that portion devoted to retracing the development of unbelief. We follow throughout the whole narrative the traces of a parallel development of faith: in Peter's confession, chap. vi.; in the selection which takes place at Jerusalem, chap. vii. and viii.; in the case of the man born blind in chap. ix., and those sheep in chap. x. who, at the shepherd's call, follow him out of the theocratic sheepfold; finally, in the case of his numerous adherents in Bethany, and amongst the multitudes on Palm-Sunday. Here are the hearts which will compose the church of Pentecost.

IV. If from chap. v. we have seen the tide of unbelief predominating, from the thirteenth chapter it is faith in the person of the disciples which becomes the preponderant element of the narrative, and that until that faith has reached its relative perfection, and Jesus can give thanks for the work accomplished (chap. xvii.). That development is effected no longer by manifestations of power, but of love and wisdom. It is, first, the washing of the feet,—intended to make them understand that true glory lies in serving and in rooting out from their heart the false Messianic ideal, which still con-

[1] Hilgenfeld, regarding, like many others, the discourse xii. 44-50 as a discourse presented as true, although purely imaginary, deduces from that fact an argument against the historical character of the other discourses, as if it did not appear from the situation itself that that discourse is given only as a summary of all the teachings of Jesus, parallel to the *résumé* of His miracles given in ver. 37,—all this with the aim of setting forth the incurable character of the obduracy of the Jews.

cealed from them the divine thought realized in Jesus. It is, next, the discourses in which He explains to them in words what He has just revealed to them by acts. He especially soothes them on the subject of the approaching separation (xiii. 31–xiv. 31): it will be followed by an early reunion, His return in the spirit. For death is to Him the way to glory; and if they cannot now follow Him into the perfect communion of the Father, they will be able to do so later in the way which He is about to open up to them. In the meanwhile, through the strength which He will impart to them, they will do in His stead what He Himself has not been able to accomplish here below. If they love Him, let them rejoice, then, rather than grieve, and receive His peace as a last farewell. After that, Jesus carries them in thought to the moment when they shall live in Him and He in them, in the same way in which the branch lives united to the vine (xv. 1–xvi. 15). He first of all points out to them the sole duty of that new position: *to abide* in Him by obeying His will. He next describes to them with all frankness the relation of hostility which will be formed between them and the world; but He also reveals to them the power which will fight by them, and by which they shall conquer: the Spirit, *who will glorify Him in them.* Finally, in concluding (xvi. 16–33), He returns to that impending separation, which preoccupies them so painfully. He forcibly describes to them both its brevity and its magnificent results. And in summing up the object of their faith in those four propositions, which mutually correspond (ver. 28): "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again I leave the world, and go to the Father," he illumines them with a clearness so vivid, that the promised day, that of the Holy Ghost, appears to them to have arrived, and they cry out: "We believe that Thou camest forth from God;" Jesus answers them: "*Do ye now believe?*" And to that profession of their faith He affixes, in chap. xvii., the seal of thanksgiving and of prayer. He asks the Father to reinstate Him in His estate of glory, which is indispensable to Him, in order that He may give eternal life to His believing followers on the earth. He gives thanks for having gained those eleven men, and prays for their preservation and their perfect consecration to the work which He entrusts to them.

Finally, He intercedes for the world, to which their word is to bring salvation. That prayer of the seventeenth chapter corresponds to the *résumé* of chap. xii. It is Jesus Himself who recapitulates, in the most solemn manner, the work accomplished in His disciples; in the same way as the conclusion of chap. xii. was the *résumé*, made by the evangelist, of the development of unbelief in the nation and amongst its rulers. Nevertheless, the element of unbelief is not entirely wanting in that picture of the development of the faith. It is represented in the inmost circle of His disciples by the traitor Judas, whose presence is frequently referred to, especially in the course of chap. xiii. The departure of Judas (ver. 30) indicates the moment when that impure element finally yields its place to the spirit of Jesus. There is in the history of Jesus more than the revelation of the character of God, and the impressions of faith and unbelief, which that revelation awakens. There is a work of reconciliation, which is being wrought out, and which prepares the way for the communication of the life of God Himself to believers. The object of faith only appears complete when it is thus unfolded to the very end. This is the reason why the history of Jesus includes, beyond the picture of His ministry of teaching, the narrative of His death and resurrection.[1] It is by means of these last facts that faith comes to the possession of its perfect object, and may attain to its full maturity, as it is by them also that the refusal is consummated which constitutes unbelief.

V. The narrative of the Passion, in chap. xviii. and xix., is related from the point of view of that Jewish unbelief which is consummated in the crucifixion of the Messiah. That portion is connected with the preceding, in which the development of that unbelief was recounted (v.–xii.). From the first step, we here remark the complete omission of the scene in Gethsemane; but after the numerous allusions to the Synoptic narratives, which we have already established, those words, "Having said that, He went forth with His disciples over the

[1] It is easy to notice the perplexity of those who, like Reuss, Hilgenfeld, etc., make the substance of the narrative of our Gospel to be the idea of *the revelation of the Logos*. They cannot account for the portions that follow.

brook Cedron, *where was a garden, into the which He entered, with His disciples,*" can only be regarded as referring the reader to the narrative of that struggle which was known from previously existing writings.[1] The deliverance of the disciples follows under the impression produced by the utterance of those words: "It is I." On the occasion of the wound inflicted by the sword, Peter and Malchus alone are designated by name in that Gospel. The narrative of the trial of Jesus only makes mention of the preliminary inquiry which took place in the house of Annas. But in expressly designating that judicial appearance as the *first* (ver. 13, "to Annas *first*"), even when a second is not recounted, and in indicating the sending of Jesus to Caiaphas (ver. 24: "Annas sent Jesus bound to Caiaphas the high priest"), the evangelist lets it here again be understood, as clearly as possible, that he presupposed as known other narratives which complete what is omitted in his. The three denials of St. Peter are not related one after another, but they are, as must in reality have been the case, interwoven with the phases of the trial of Jesus (xviii. 15–27). The tableau of the appearance before Pilate (xviii. 28 to xix. 16) unveils with admirable precision the bold, and at the same time crafty, tactics of the Jews. The instinct of truth, and the perhaps somewhat superstitious respect for the mysterious person of Jesus, which restrain Pilate till at last he yields to the requirements of personal interest,—the cunning of the Jews, who pass without shame from one injury to another, and who end by wresting from Pilate, through the influence of fear, what they despair of obtaining from him in the name of justice, but who only gain that shameful victory at the price of the denial of their most cherished hopes, and of formal submission to the empire, pronounced by their own lips (xix. 15: "We have no king but Cæsar"),—all that is described with an incomparable knowledge of the situation. Here, perhaps, is the masterpiece of the Johannine narrative.

One feature of that narrative ought to be specially noticed. In xviii. 28, the Jews will not enter into the judgment-hall of Pilate, "lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the Passover." The Paschal feast was then not yet celebrated

[1] It is inconceivable to see in that omission a dogmatic intention, after the scene xii. 23 ff. related by John, and by John alone.

on the day of the death of Christ, according to our Gospel; it ought to be so only in the evening. It was then the 14th Nisan, the day of the *preparation* of the Passover. That circumstance is brought forward with so evident a purpose in several other passages (xiii. 1, 29, xix. 31, etc.), that we are led to think of other accounts which have placed the death of Christ only on the *following* day, 15th Nisan, and after the Paschal feast. Now this is what the synoptic narrative really appears to do. A fresh proof of the constant relation between the two accounts. In the picture of the crucifixion, the individual who had already played a part on the last evening is the only one of the disciples who is found near the cross. To him Jesus entrusts His mother. It is he, likewise, who sees the water and the blood flow from the pierced side of Jesus; and who verifies in that fact the simultaneous accomplishment of two prophecies.

VI. The narrative of the resurrection (chap. xx.) includes the picture of three appearances which took place in Judea: that which was accorded to Mary Magdalene near the sepulchre; that which took place in the evening in the presence of all the disciples, and in which Jesus renewed to the apostles their commission, and imparted to them the first-fruits of Pentecost; that, finally, which occurred eight days afterwards, and in which the unbelief of Thomas was overcome. From thence we perceive, that even as the element of faith was not entirely wanting in the scenes of the Passion (it is enough to recall the varied parts played by the disciple whom Jesus loved, by the women, by Joseph of Arimathea, by Nicodemus), so also the element of unbelief was not awanting in the portion which describes the triumph of faith. The exclamation of adoration by Thomas: "My Lord and my God," in which the faith of the most incredulous of the disciples suddenly takes the most daring flight and attains the height of its aim, such as is announced in the prologue, brings the narrative to a conclusion. It is thus that the end unites itself with the starting-point.

The Son of God, Jewish unbelief, the faith of the church,—these three aspects, previously indicated in the prologue, are fully discussed: the subject is then exhausted.

VII. The two last verses of chap. xx. form the conclusion of the book.[1] The author there declares the aim which he set before him. It is not a complete history which he wished to relate; it is, as we ourselves have proved, a selection of certain features designed to produce amongst his readers belief in the Messiahship and in the divinity of Jesus, faith in which they will find life, as he himself had found it in the same.

VIII. Chap. xxi., in consequence of what precedes it, is a supplement. Is it from the hand of the author? The arguments for and against this are still a matter of discussion. It is not of much importance; for, even if it *did* proceed from any other hand than that of the evangelist, that hand has merely edited a narrative which was frequently uttered by his lips. In this way the resemblance of style, and of the manner of narration between that appendix and the book itself, is naturally explained. That appendix must have been added at a very early date, and before the publication of the work, since it is not wanting in any manuscript or version. It completes the narrative of the appearances of Jesus, by relating one of them which took place in Galilee. Jesus gives to the disciples, by a symbolical act which is connected with their worldly vocation, the pledge of the immense success of their future apostleship (xxi. 1–14). Then He reinstates Peter, and replaces him at the head of the company of believers and of the college of the apostles. Finally, He announces to him his martyrdom, by which he will succeed in effacing the stain of his denial. The author takes advantage of that opportunity to restore the exact tenor of the words which Jesus had uttered on that occasion concerning the disciple whom He loved. It had been erroneously concluded from those words, incorrectly repeated, that he was not to die. Jesus had not said that. That appendix must naturally have been drawn up, either at the moment when it was seen that the death of that disciple was at hand, or immediately after that event, with the object

[1] Hilgenfeld, with some others, thinks that he can maintain that the narrative goes on till the end of chap. xxi. But that is to come into collision with the evidence. M. Renan says, without any hesitation: "With all critics, I conclude the first redaction of the fourth Gospel at chap. xx." (p. 534).

of anticipating or dispelling the scandal which would have arisen, or which might have already been caused, by the contradiction between that fact and the promise of the Lord.[1]

In that appendix may be noticed a want of coherence, which is foreign to the rest of the Gospel. It is a desultory narrative, the unity of which can only be established in an artificial manner. We can only see in it an amalgam of incoherent recollections which have not passed through the elaboration of a written work, *and which have issued from time to time from the lips of the narrator.*[2] Vv. 24 and 25, which close that appendix, are, without dispute, from a different hand than that of the author of the Gospel. "*We know,*" is said in name of several. The singular returns in ver. 25, "*I think.*" He who here speaks in his own name is undoubtedly the most influential member of the preceding whole (ver. 24), he who wields the pen in the name of all. Those two verses attest that the disciple specially beloved by Jesus is he "who testifieth of these things, and who wrote them." From the opposition between the present *testifieth* and the past *wrote*, it seems to follow that the authors of these lines added them between the moment when the work was completed and that of the death of the author, whilst he was still orally testifying concerning the things which he had seen and heard. They were those whose duty it was, as depositaries of the work, to make provision when the proper time had arrived for its publication. The entire book, then, is composed of *eight* parts, *five* of which form the body of the narrative or the history properly so called; *one*, the preamble; *one*, the conclusion; the *eighth* is a supplement.

On the permanent basis of the whole history, the revelation of the person and the work of the Son of God are sketched out, at first in a confused manner (i. 19–iv.), then in a more and more decided way, the two moral facts of unbelief and of faith; of the unbelief which repels the object of faith in pro-

[1] M. Renan recognises in this chapter "an almost contemporaneous addition by the author himself or by his disciples" (p. 534).

[2] "That conclusion resembles," says M. Renan, "a series of private notes, which have a meaning only for him who wrote them, or for the initiated" (p. 535).

portion as it discloses itself more fully (v.–xii.), and which ends even by outwardly suppressing it (xviii.–xix.), and of the faith which apprehends it with increasing eagerness (xiii.–xvii.), and which concludes by embracing it in all its sublimity (xx.).

The *prologue* (i. 1–18) brings that history into connection with the work of creation *through* the unity of plan and of agent which binds them together, and shows its supreme value for humanity and each individual man.

In the *conclusion* (xx. 30, 31), the evangelist unfolds his aim in drawing up that narrative; he wished to give an account of the birth and development of that faith in the Son of God which is now preached in the world.

The *appendix* (xxi.) does not belong to the organic structure of the work; it is a collection of isolated facts, the remembrance of which was precious to the author, and which he used to relate as occasion offered. One of the author's friends, who transcribed it, added a postscript to it in the name of his colleagues. This exposition will be sufficient to set aside every hypothesis opposed to the unity of the work. The fourth Gospel is indeed, according to the felicitous expression of Strauss, "the robe without seam, for which lots may be cast, but which cannot be divided."

CHAPTER II.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

We shall endeavour to characterize this work from three points of view: *historiographical*, *theological*, and *literary*.

I.

Historiographical Characteristics.

I. We have already noticed, in concluding the analysis of this Gospel, the feature which strikes us most forcibly in it—that is, its unity. By that we understand the harmony between the different portions of the narrative, especially between the starting-point and the termination, the continuity of its progress, and the harmony of all the details with the central idea.

Not that the progress is, as has been alleged, regulated in accordance with certain abstract ideas, such as those of the Word, of Life, of Light, etc., or that it is determined, as Baur wished to prove, by the internal dialectics of the Christian idea. With such methods of interpretation we reach only subtleties, and run against certain parts, those of the Passion and Resurrection, for instance, which resist the purely logical process by which it is sought to explain the work. The unity of our Gospel rests on the very continuity of the historical development. We perceive it, for instance, under its most palpable form in the remarkable gradation of the enmity against Jesus; in chap. i., the uneasy glance which the Sanhedrim casts on the activity of the forerunner; in chap. ii., the unsympathetic and distrustful reception accorded to the first attempt at reformation which proceeded from Jesus Himself; in chap. iv., the attention aroused at Jerusalem by a rumour of a malevolent tendency regarding the increasing influence of Jesus; in chap. v., the first outburst of the enmity of the rulers on the occasion of the miracle wrought on the Sabbath day, and the alleged blasphemy of Jesus,—at that time there had already arisen the thought of getting rid of Him; in chap. vii., the first legal step, the sending forth of the officers to seize Him; at the end of chap. viii., the first attempt to stone Him; in chap. ix., the first mention of a legal penal measure, the excommunication of His followers (ver. 22); in chap. x., a second attempt at stoning to death, still more serious than the first; finally, in chap. xi., a positive decision of the Sanhedrim to put Jesus to death, and an official invitation to accusers to present themselves. From that moment the issue is only a question of time; and that is not long in being decided, in chap. xii., by the Messianic entry of Jesus into Jerusalem. That event leaves no other alternative to the Sanhedrim save to yield up the direction of the theocracy into the hands of Jesus, or to put Him to death. In the same chapter, finally, there appear the first symptoms of the hostility of the traitor. The fruit is ripe, it has only to fall. But it is not merely in that progressive march of hatred, it is also in that of faith that we prove the continuity and the unity of the narrative. After the first word of the prologue has laid down the object of faith in all its sublimity, the narrative shows us how

the faith of the disciples, especially that of the author, is formed and gradually elevated to the height of that object. Andrew, John, Philip, Peter, first of all recognise in Jesus the Messiah, such as the forerunner has described Him to them (chap. i.). Nathanael, struck by the superior wisdom of Jesus, salutes in that Messiah the appearance of a being standing in a special relation to God. At Cana (chap. ii.) the faith of the disciples is confirmed by the sight of an act which reveals His power and goodness; that growth of their faith henceforth continues, keeping pace with the ever fresh manifestations of the glory of Jesus in deeds and in words. Peter, as the spokesman of the Twelve, makes the first solemn profession of that faith (vi. 68, 69) in proclaiming Jesus *the Holy One of God*, on the ground of an acquired and personal experience, and in face of the victory of unbelief which had lately deprived Jesus of almost all His disciples. The controversies in chap. vii.–x., in calling forth on the part of Jesus ever more striking proofs of His divine nature, put to the test that faith so boldly professed, and cause it to increase, as hurricanes fix in the soil those trees which they have not succeeded in uprooting; so that Thomas, in chap. xi., prefers, if needful, to go and die with Him in Judea, rather than permit Him to go there alone (ver. 16). The last discourses of Jesus (chap. xiii.–xvi.) elevate that faith of the disciples to the state of relative perfection which it can attain during the life of Jesus. The summit is finally reached after the resurrection; it is then that the author unconditionally says of himself: "And he saw *and believed*," and the faith of the most distrustful of the disciples rises with a bound to the height of its divine object in the cry of *adoration* from Thomas. That word is in its entirety the limit of the development of the faith of the disciples, and of the narrative itself.

There is even similar unity in the narrative in regard to the secondary personages. Nicodemus, for instance, in chap. iii., comes to Jesus by night; in chap. vii., he takes courage to speak in His favour in the Sanhedrim, no doubt while presenting himself as the defender of an axiom of law; in chap. xix., his faith finally overcomes all obstacles; he announces it by uniting with Joseph of Arimathea to render royal homage

to the crucified Jesus. Similar unity, similar gradation in the tableau of the impressions and conduct of Pilate (chap. xviii., xix.), as well as in the enumeration of the means employed by the Jews to extort from him the condemnation of Jesus.

When the Synoptic Gospels are charged with want of unity, we do not allow that imputation; but we can understand it. Their narrative very often seems only a collection of detached facts, of traits accidentally placed in juxtaposition, which may be omitted, displaced, multiplied at will, without altering the basis of the narrative. But a similar reproach cannot be justified in respect to our Gospel; and Baur, at all events, has put an end to it for ever. Even the discourses do not break the thread of the narrative. Very far from retarding its progress, as if they were merely useless metaphysical superfluities, they are, on the contrary, the most decisive factors in the action. Those solemn testimonies of Jesus concerning His person and the moral condition of the Jews, simultaneously determine the increase of hatred on the one side, and the establishment of faith on the other. Without the discourses our Gospel would resemble a drama without dialogues; what would become of the action? We cannot, then, be surprised at the failure, now almost universally recognised, of the attempts at selection, which we have previously enumerated, between certain discourses which may be Johannine and facts which may be inauthentic (Weisse); between discourses which proceed from a disciple of Jesus, and the narration of facts which go back to the apostle himself (M. Renan); between the *Galilean* scenes, which arise from subsequent interpolations, and the authentic *Judæan* basis of the Gospel (Schweizer). These hypotheses are for ever buried in the tomb, which Baur has dug for them by his forcible demonstration of the unity of our Gospel.

II. And yet, in spite of that powerful unity, the evangelical narrative has none the less in that work a *fragmentary* character; and that contrast is not one of the least striking antinomies which make of the fourth Gospel so strange a literary phenomenon.

The starting-point of the narrative is selected in the midst of the career of the forerunner, and after the baptism of Jesus

Himself; for the testimony of John, related in i. 19 ff., implies in him the knowledge already acquired of the Messianic dignity of Jesus. The history, as such, then wants in some sort its necessary *front* (comp. the three Synoptics). Curtailed at the beginning, it is likewise so at the end. The narrative concludes with Thomas' act of adoration, thus before the ascension, which, however, the author knows and admits (vi. 62, xx. 17). Blanks likewise occur in the course of the narrative. The return of Jesus into Galilee (iv. 1 ff.) must have taken place in the month of December (ver. 35), and the following journey to Jerusalem (chap. v.) at the earliest, for the feast of Purim, in the month of March; here, then, is an interval of three months, concerning which the author preserves complete silence. The following fact, that of the multiplication of the loaves (chap. vi.), took place at the time of the Passover. Here again is a month concerning which we are without information. Chap. vii. brings us to the feast of Tabernacles, consequently to the end of September or beginning of October; we thus make out a vacant space of from six to seven months (x. 22). Jesus visits Jerusalem at the feast of the Dedication. That indication brings us to the end of December, three months after the last fact narrated; and not one word about the way in which that quarter of the year was passed! When, in chap. xi., Jesus is summoned to Bethany, it is shortly before the Passover (ver. 55). Here again two months have elapsed anew, without any mention of what has happened during that period!

During the two years of the public activity of Jesus, from the initial Passover of chap. ii. to the last (xii.–xx.), we make out, then, a space of *fifteen entire months*, which remain there in the narrative like unused compartments, divisions distinctly indicated but completely empty. Some thirty days dispersed over those vast spaces alone form the subject of the narrative. Why not recognise the broken, and intentionally broken, character of such a narrative? If it did not suppose others known to its readers, and which furnish them with the materials necessary for filling in those outlines, it would be simply absurd.[1]

[1] Can we understand how, in face of such facts, a writer who respects himself can dare to write the following lines: "John," it is well known (?), "presen.s

But it presents phenomena of detail still more strange. It is said in vi. 2, "that a multitude followed Jesus into Galilee, seeing the *miracles which He did.*" Now the author is silent concerning all those miracles. It is said in vii. 1 that Jesus "*continued to go and come into Galilee,* not wishing to go to Jerusalem, where the Jews sought to kill Him." And of all these journeys to the interior of Galilee, not one word in the narrative! Is it not evident that these clearly indicated blanks infer other narratives comprising the facts not included in them? Other details again demonstrate the designedly fragmentary character of the Johannine narrative. In ii. 23 mention is made of those who "believed *when they saw the miracles which Jesus did,*" and in iii. 2 Nicodemus himself makes allusion to such miracles; in iv. 43 it is stated that the Galileans gladly received Jesus on His return to them, "having seen all the things which He did at Jerusalem." And not a single one of those miracles performed by Jesus during His first sojourn in the capital is related. In i. 41 Andrew is designated as *the brother of Simon Peter,* at a time when the latter has not yet appeared on the scene! In xi. 1 Bethany is called *the town of Mary and her sister Martha;* and yet no allusion has been made to these two women! In xi. 2 Mary is designated as she who had anointed the Lord with ointment; and that trait, which is to show the reader where He is, has not yet been related! In vi. 70 Jesus says: "Have I not chosen *you twelve?*" and hitherto we have only heard of the call of Andrew, John, Simon, Philip, and Nathanael. The Twelve are still unknown persons in that narrative. In xiv. 22 the presence amongst the Twelve of another Judas than the traitor is supposed to be known, but without his ever having been mentioned. In iii. 24 the evangelist corrects an inaccurate idea which he imagines to exist in the mind of his readers, which is, that John was already imprisoned when Jesus was sojourning for the second time in Judea. "*For John,*" he says, "*was not yet cast into prison.*" Now nothing in the preceding statements could have given rise to that idea, which he considers it right expressly to set aside. In xviii. 24 it is said that "Annas

no trace of blanks or divisions in which might be placed the materials furnished by the Synoptics."—(STAP, *Etudes Historiques,* p. 259.)

sent Jesus bound unto Caiaphas the high priest." But to what purpose is such a remark? The session before Caiaphas is not related nor even mentioned in what follows, although it may be certainly presupposed from the sentence of death, the confirmation of which the Sanhedrim demand from Pilate. Our narrative is, then, full of blanks, and of blanks of which the author cannot but be perfectly conscious. He, moreover, expresses himself on that point with a distinctness which leaves nothing to be desired, when he says, xx. 30, "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of His disciples *which are not written in this book* (*ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ*)." These last words are important. The evangelist would not have expressed himself in such a manner if, as we have just proved, he had not had other books in view, by means of which his readers might fill up the blanks in his, and understand the allusions they contain.[1]

And can we have any doubt in answer to the question, What are these writings? Is not the election of the Twelve related by Mark and Luke (Mark iii., Luke vi.)? Are not Martha and Mary the two sisters with whom we make acquaintance in Luke x.? Is not the blending into one of the two first returns of Jesus into Galilee (i. 44, iv. 1 ff.), by reason of which the first return seemed to connect itself with the imprisonment of John the Baptist, patent in our Synoptics, especially in Matthew and Mark? Is not the meeting of the Sanhedrim in the house of Caiaphas, where the sentence was pronounced against Jesus, most circumstantially related in Matthew and Mark? In general, all that Galilean ministry, of which the fourth Gospel only gives us the outlines, is it not in the Synoptic Gospels that we find the detailed account? We cannot, then, be in any doubt as to the true cause of the blanks which are presented to us by the narrative of John. They are equivalent to so many references to the narrative of our Synoptic Gospels, which, at the period when our author thus wrote, were consequently already dispersed throughout the churches. Can we imagine that such a man as M. Reuss

[1] M. Renan, who does not here introduce prejudices foreign to the subject, does not hesitate to recognise the fact. "The position of the Johannine writer is that of an author who is not ignorant that the subject of which he treats has already been written about, who approves of many things which have been said, but who believes that he possesses more trustworthy information, and gives it without disturbing himself about others" (p. 531).

could shut his eyes to the truth so far as to say: "It is only *with difficulty* that we can discover in that Gospel traces of a connection with Gospels which are alleged to have previously existed. . . .

. . . "The facts do not *absolutely* compel us to admit that the author was acquainted with our Synoptic Gospels."[1] Baur, Hilgenfeld, and many others, in return, thoroughly recognise the fact. Thus, on the one side, the Johannine narrative presents itself as a composition thrown off at once, organic and homogeneous; on the other, it produces the effect of a desultory narrative, in which the empty spaces predominate over those which are filled up. These are its two first distinctive features. We state a third, which will perhaps explain the two preceding ones; that is, its autobiographical character.

III. The author offers himself as an *eye-witness* of the facts which he relates. In i. 14 he says, "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the Only-begotten of the Father), full[2] of grace and truth." Every unprejudiced reader will admit that those words: "*we beheld*," are intended to designate an eye-witness. Baur and Keim understand them in a spiritual sense; according to them, it is a question of the internal view of faith,[3] which is the heritage of every Christian. 2 Cor. iii. 18 is quoted: "But we all, with open face, behold, as in a glass, the glory of the Lord." But Paul says, "*we behold*," an expression which indicates a permanent act, and not: "we beheld," a term which alludes to a determinate historical fact, now accomplished. Then that expression is included by John in the description of the historical fact of the incarnation: "The Word was made flesh—we beheld—full of grace and truth." Finally, there is extant another declaration from the same hand, still more positive, 1 John i. 1–4: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of

[1] *Gesch. der heil. Schr. N. T.*, sec. 222.

[2] That adjective *full* can in the Greek only refer to the substantive *the Word*, the subject of the whole verse.

[3] Keim: "Above all, the eye-witness indicated in i. 14 and at the beginning of the Epistle is such as every Christian may attribute to himself" (vol. i. p. 157).

the word of life, we declare unto you." The expressions are evidently chosen in such a way as not to allow of any ambiguity. Moreover, the very idea of declaring, which can only have reference to the publication of an *historical* fact, and the opposition established between those who announce the news and those who receive it to enjoy it with the first,—all that absolutely excludes the idea of a fact simply internal, and belonging to all Christians.[1] Shall we grant, perhaps, that the author wishes to pass for an eye-witness, but without having been such? It seems to me sufficient to read the Epistle whence those words are taken, to be convinced that we have not to do with an author who could try to make himself pass for what he was not.

Moreover, the very contents of the Gospel confirm the autobiographical character asserted by these witnesses. Between an historian properly so called and an eye-witness who describes the event in which he has taken part, there is this difference, that the former exhibits the fact in itself from the time of its appearance, through its different phases, down to the end; the second, on the contrary, takes hold of it at the moment when he himself was affected by it, and makes prominent the sides which he has personally felt.

An old soldier relating the battle of Leipsic, in which he had taken part, describes it, if we may so say, under the particular angle from which he personally observed it; he indicates the position which his corps occupied at the moment when the general shock invaded his column, and so on; whilst the historian describes the totality of the fact, and from an objective general point of view. If we judge of our Gospel in accordance with that distinction, which is easily apprehended, we shall very quickly recognise to which of these two classes of narratives it belongs. The author takes his starting-point, not, as in the Synoptics, from the beginning of the ministry of John the Baptist, or even from the beginning of the ministry of Jesus, but from the day and hour when *he* heard the forerunner assert the presence of the Messiah, and when the first gleam of faith shone into *his* soul. The two days which follow are

[1] Holtzmann, *Schenkel's Bibellexicon*, art. "Johannes," objects that the object of these accumulated verbs is not clearly discerned; but that object is manifest: "the Word in which life resides, and which was manifested."

the two which played an absolutely decisive part in *his* life, those during which was formed *his* personal relation to Jesus. Such a beginning belongs to autobiography, and not to history in the ordinary sense of the word. That same characteristic distinguishes the whole narrative. It is his own experience which the author relates when he concludes the narrative of the marriage at Cana with this remark: "And His disciples believed on Him;" or when, after the purification of the temple, he observes that it was only after the resurrection that His disciples remembered the words spoken by Jesus on that occasion, and understood them. It is his heart, as that of a witness, which we hear beating, when, after each one of the moments when Jesus has been exposed to imminent danger, we read in his narrative that expression which is, as it were, a cry of deliverance: "But His hour was not yet come." It is indeed a feature of his spiritual biography which we lay hold of in that expression: "And he saw and believed,"—by which he describes the impression made upon him by the sight of the napkin wrapped up and laid apart in the sepulchre; so much so that, when he comes back to speak also of his companion Peter, he says, no longer in the singular, but in the plural: "For *as yet they knew not* (ᾔδεισαν) that Jesus must rise again from the dead."

Regarded from this point of view, we understand that the author concluded his narrative, not with the fact of the ascension, the regular end of the history of Jesus (and that according to our Gospel itself, vi. 62, xx. 17), but with the invocation of Thomas. That moment had been the culminating point in the development of his own faith. It formed, then, the legitimate close of a narrative whose starting-point had been the birth of that faith itself. The birth and the development of the author's faith, such is the angle under which the ministry of Jesus is presented in that Gospel. That is autobiography, and not history properly so called. We have delayed till now to speak of the passage, xix. 35. Those words play an important part in this question. Some writers see in them a decisive proof in support of the autobiographical character of the Gospel, others regard them as decisive against that way of considering it. The evangelist, having just mentioned the water and the blood which flowed from

the pierced side of Jesus, adds: "And he that saw it bare record, and his record is true; and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe." There, say some, is the declaration of the author himself that he was a witness of that scene. But others (Keim, Weizsäcker himself) reason differently. The person who has borne witness of the fact is not identical with the author of the book; for that very passage distinguishes from each other the witness who instructed the author, and the author who testifies to the veracity of the witness. There has been urged in favour of this explanation, the use of the pronoun *he that* (ἐκεῖνος); the author, it is said, cannot have used it to speak of himself; for the pronoun necessarily refers to a remote subject, to a third person.[1] Nevertheless, Weizsäcker and Keim now-a-days give up that grammatical argument. The pronoun in question is employed in the fourth Gospel to indicate a person not as more remote than another, but as possessing the quality, which is the point in question, in an eminent or even exclusive degree. Thus in i. 18 it is said: "*He* hath declared," in the sense, "He *only* hath" . . .; comp. also v. 39. The unanswerable proof that the subject speaking may describe himself by this pronoun, "*he that*," appears from ix. 37: "And it is *he that* talketh with thee" (ἐκεῖνός ἐστι). It is evident that when the subject objectivizes himself to the third person to the point of thus speaking of himself, he may also use, in order to designate himself, the pronoun of the third person. It is to logic that Weizsäcker and Keim now appeal; the attestation which the writer here gives to the veracity of the witness proves that these two persons are different. That conclusion, which seems logical, is so in a very slight degree. For if the declaration of veracity given to the witness by the writer is the expression of an act of *inmost consciousness*, what can we conclude, save that the witness and the writer are identical? Now such is precisely the case in this passage. For if the writer who gives the attestation had been a different person from the witness to whom it is given, he ought to have said, not "*he knows*," but "*I know*, or *we know*, that *his* testimony is true" (as xxi. 24). The words: "That *ye might believe*," lead to the

[1] See the interesting discussion between Buttmann (*Studien u. Kritiken*, 1860) and Steitz (*ibid.*, 1859 and 1861).

same result. The contrast being once established between the witness who has himself seen and the church which believes on his testimony, the writer took his place amongst believers, and should have said: "That *we may believe*." Is it not then evident that the evangelist, a witness of the fact related, himself attests, in view of the difficulties which his narrative presented, *the inmost certainty* which he possessed of the reality of facts so astonishing? If he speaks of himself in the third person, it is as Jesus Himself does throughout the whole Gospel, when instead of saying "*I*," He says, "*The Son of man;*" it is as St. Paul does in 2 Cor. xii. 3, in that remarkable expression: "I knew such a *man*, how that he was caught up into paradise," as we speak in ordinary language every time when we wish to make prominent, not the person, but the special quality in which he presents himself. The author, relating as witness a fact which he only has seen, appeals to the assured internal consciousness which he has, that he has not been the victim of an illusion of the senses. That passage, xix. 35 (which Baur has likewise endeavoured to refer to the internal vision of faith!), sets the seal on the autobiographical character of the entire book. If that assertion were not that of a witness, it would only remain to see in it the work of a forger. But when did a forger ever imagine so strange a form as that which we meet with in that parenthesis? It is the most immediate expression of a consciousness sure of itself.

IV. We come to the most important, but likewise the most disputed, characteristic of the Johannine narrative, that of its *historical truth*.

It is to no purpose that the question of the historical truth of the fourth Gospel has been closely connected with that of its apostolic origin; it is logically distinct from it. On one side we may, as Mr. Matthew Arnold has lately done in a remarkable work,[1] maintain the entire credibility of our Gospel, whilst attributing the drawing up of that writing to another pen than that of the apostle; on the other, we see men, such as M. Reuss, rejecting the historical credibility of the discourses without

[1] *Contemporary Review*, July 1875: "Review of Objections to Literature and Dogma, VI."

denying the Johannine composition of the Gospel. It can then only be of great advantage for the certainty of the final result, to treat the first question, that of credibility, in a manner completely independent of that of the authenticity. Each of these two results, separately obtained, may serve as a check to the other.

The examination which we undertake will bear on these two orders of subjects: A, the *facts;* B, the *discourses:*—

A. *The Facts.*

We have already sketched Baur's point of view, which remains the basis on which rest all the present attacks against the credibility of our Gospel. That narrative is said to be only an artificial composition, intended to present the idea of the Logos. In order to trace that picture, the author did not possess any knowledge of the life of Jesus which was peculiar to Himself; the only historical materials which entered into his narrative are those which he has borrowed from the Synoptic Gospels. The progress of the narrative is purely dialectic in its nature, so that the fourth Gospel is only a Hegelian logic in action. It is the *idea* which creates, or which at least radically transforms, the history. It is Keim who has perhaps best developed the considerations which lead to this view. The following is a summary of them, such as they fill, under different forms, the works of modern critics belonging to this tendency.

Let us first of all point out three facts regarded by many as fitted to throw an unfavourable light on the nature of our narrative:—

I. A purely *speculative idea,* that of the Logos, inscribed on the beginning of the work. "When a historian," says Keim, "commences by displaying his philosophy, we may be sure that we have to do with a man whose historical communications are subordinated to his personal theories" (I. p. 124).

II. The defective process which the author admits (xx. 30), that of a selection, to which he had given himself, from among the facts belonging to his subject. "It can only be," says Keim again, "a half-true picture which comes from him who merely

describes certain aspects of the history, omitting all the others" (p. 122).

III. The symmetrical *rhythmical* character of the narrative: "Three sojourns in Galilee; three at Jerusalem; twice three feasts, in particular three Passovers; three miracles in Galilee, three at Jerusalem; twice three days spent with the forerunner; three days employed in the resurrection of Lazarus; six given to the last Passover; three words on the cross; three appearances of the risen Jesus, etc. True history does not thus proceed according to the Trinitarian rhythm. Such a narrative is the product of art" (Keim, p. 123).

The unfavourable presumption which results from these observations is definitely confirmed, we are assured, by the following facts:—

1. A multitude of historical, topographical, and other *errors* proves that the author composed according to his fancy, and in entire ignorance of the circumstances of place and of time in which the facts related must have occurred. MM. Nicolas and Reville adhere more or less to that opinion.[1]

2. The *image of Christ* sketched in this work bears in the face of it the seal of fiction. It is purely and simply the Logos of Philo, which appears here below without entering into a real human life. "He is not born, is not baptized; He does not struggle, and does not suffer; He knows all, foresees all, can do all from the very outset. That divine glory which radiates from Him does not correspond to the conditions of human nature; it is perfection instead of *progress*" (Keim, pp. 125 and 136). We find our critics[2] vying with each other in their variations on this theme in all its styles. There is especially one comparison which they delight to employ, that of a "motionless statue in the niche of a cathedral."

3. With the preceding feature is closely connected the alleged *absence of all progress* in the narrative, whether in the

[1] The first says: "The author is not in the least conversant either with the history or the beliefs of the Jews, or even with the geography of Palestine" (*Etudes Critiques*, etc., p. 198); the second: "The country does not seem very familiar to the author."

[2] M. Reville: "A Christ without temptations, without failings. . . . Nothing astonishes Him, nothing deceives Him; He has foreseen all from the first day: that Jesus is a stranger to humanity."

conceptions of Jesus or in those of His disciples, or, finally, in the sentiments of His adversaries. From the beginning Jesus already knows the end; the disciples recognise Him from the first day as the Messiah and the Son of God; the Jews have already determined, in chap. v., to put Him to death.[1]

4. That history of Christ is, moreover, in flagrant *contradiction* with that of the Synoptic Gospels, both as regards the whole, the general outline, and the details. In the latter there is a ministry of one year only; here, an active life of nearly three years: there, a ministry of which almost the only stage is Galilee; here, frequent sojourns at Jerusalem, where all the important scenes occur. Add to this fundamental opposition a multitude of very serious contradictions in details—for instance, that of the date of the day of the death of Jesus, here evidently transformed in the interests of the symbolism of the Paschal lamb, etc.

5. The *miracles* of the fourth Gospel surpass to such a degree the analogous facts narrated in the Synoptics, that that very exaggeration betrays their factitious character. And, independently of this difference, the miraculous element in itself is sufficient to deprive the narrative of a strictly historical character. The supernatural cannot be real.[2]

Such are the chief reasons which are urged against the historical value of the Johannine narrative. We shall take as rapid a survey as possible of the vast domain which the different objections embrace. We begin with simple presumptions.

1. The inscription of the term Logos at the beginning of the Gospel. The presence of a philosophical term, or of a speculative idea, at the head of a narrative can be explained in two ways: either, as Baur imagines, in the case we are now considering the author indicates by it the philosophical idea in view of which he invents his narrative, or else it may also happen that he merely wishes by it to sum up the general

[1] M. Stap: "The issue may be found in the first page quite as well as in the last, without the action having suffered from it" (p. 268).

[2] M. Renan: "Until further orders we shall maintain this principle of historical criticism, that a supernatural narrative cannot be admitted as such, that it always implies credulity or imposture" (p. xcviii.)

idea which has been in his opinion eliminated from the facts, and which is in his eyes the key to them. It is thus that Sallust begins his history of Catiline with a philosophical dissertation, without any one imagining on that account that the narrative of the conspiracy is merely a romance composed on that theme. It is not the fact which has come out of the idea; on the contrary, it is the idea which has proceeded from the contemplation of the fact.

In regard to the Gospel of John, we have, then, the alternative between these two methods of procedure. And the choice is not difficult. Here is the way in which a decidedly impartial writer, M. Renan, expresses himself on that question: "An artificial writing, a kind of *à priori* gospel, composed in the second century, would not have possessed that character. . . . Artificial compositions never have that personal turn. Something vague and awkward always betrays them. An ancient sacred book exists; they seek in it for hidden meanings. That is a case of which there are many instances to be met with; but that an extensive historical work should be written with the afterthought of concealing in it symbolical subtleties which could only be discovered 1700 years later, is a case which is rarely seen. . . . Allegory is essentially cold and stiff. Its personages are of brass, and move all of a piece. It is not so with our author. What strikes us is the life, the reality."[1] That is the language of good sense opposed to that of *à priori* criticism. The idea of the Logos, very far from being the mother of the narrative, is the daughter of it. The question is merely to know whether it proceeds from it lawfully,—whether the author has derived that idea *from* the history in which it was in reality involved, or else whether he himself has imported it *into* the history as the result of personal bias. That question is altogether different; and whatever may be the solution which is given to it, the historical value of the narrative is independent of that solution.

2. A narrative may very well contain only an extract of the facts, determined by a certain point of view, without ceasing on that account to be entirely true; but undoubtedly on one condition, which is, that its readers are supposed to be *au fait* with the whole history, a certain side of which is de-

[1] *Life of Jesus*, 13th ed. pp. 509, 520, 530.

scribed in that narrative. Now, unequivocal indications, recognised at the present time by critics of the most opposite schools, demonstrate that the narrative of the fourth Gospel implies on the part of its readers the knowledge of the evangelical tradition diffused throughout the church in the very form in which we find it in our Synoptics. Thus the second argument of Keim falls to the ground. The author could make a selection without falsifying the history, because the history was already known to his readers.

The Trinitarian rhythm pointed out in the narrative would require to be better demonstrated than it really is. Three sojourns in Galilee are spoken of; in reality there is only one, lasting from the month of December, indicated in iv. 35, down to the month of December in the following year (x. 22), and interrupted by the two journeys to Jerusalem of chap. v. (in spring) and of chap. vii. (in autumn). Where is the rhythm? Three journeys to Jerusalem are spoken of, in reality there are five of them: that of chap. ii. at the first Passover; that of chap. v. at the feast of Purim; that of chap. vii. at the feast of Tabernacles; that of the second part of chap. x. at the feast of Dedication; and that of chap. xii. at the last Passover, with which we may join, or from which we may separate, the rapid excursion to Bethany in chap. xi. Where is the rhythm? Three feasts of the Passover are spoken of; but that alleged triad is broken by this fact, that two only of these feasts are celebrated by Jesus at Jerusalem, He spends the third in Galilee. The narrative contains three miracles performed at Jerusalem (chap. v., ix., and xi.); the fact is true. But may we not here apply the answer which M. Renan gives to the critics who claim to place the Johannine narrative under the rhythm of the number seven? "I believe in symbolical views when they are indicated, and, if I may venture so to say, underlined by the author. I do not believe in them when they do not spontaneously reveal themselves. The allegorical exegete never speaks in half words; he displays his argument, and delights to insist upon it. I say as much in regard to the sacramental numbers. The adversaries of the fourth Gospel have remarked, that the miracles which it relates are seven in number. If the author himself took special account of them,

that would be a serious matter, and would prove a bias in a given direction. If the author did not take account of them, we can only see therein an accident." The three miracles accomplished at Jerusalem are set in relief by our author, because they were the signs of the three stages in the development of the Jewish hatred. Must we suspect the reality of all historical movements which are measured by three times? Twice three days, says Keim, spent in the company of John the Baptist! The three first correspond to the three more and more energetic testimonies of the forerunner, which led the author to become a believer. What is there suspicious in that? Of the three other days, the first is that of the departure for Galilee; the third is that of the miracle at Cana; but the second is not even mentioned, which proves that the author had no intention whatever of employing symbolism. In regard to the resurrection of Lazarus, it is not of three days, it is of *four* (xi. 39), that we have to speak. As to the allegorical meaning which is sought for in the six days which are mentioned in xii. 1, which are in allusion to the Jewish custom of choosing the Paschal lamb on the 10th Nisan, the sixth day before the Passover (Ex. xii. 3–6), M. Renan simply replies, "Of that there would be little indication." And how could Greek readers, without any indication, divine the thought of the author? The other allegations of the same kind are not of greater value than those referred to. We have just established that the presumptions have a very slight foundation; let us pass on to the proofs properly so called.

1. And, first of all, the topographical and historical *inaccuracies.* We remark that even Keim abandons that argument. "We are silent," he says, "as regards that rubric of historical and geographical errors which it is the custom to point out. We can all the less believe in them that the author manifests a tolerable (*sic!*) knowledge of the country, and that the greatest difficulties are explained by his special intentions" (p. 133). *Bethany* (i. 28, according to the most probable reading) might very well have existed previous to the Jewish war, and not be found again at a later time. There were two Antiochs, two Bethlehems, two Bethsaidas, two Canas; why should there not have been two Bethanys? That name may

have two meanings: *the place of poverty* (*Beth-anijjah*), and *the place of the ferry boat* (*Beth-on-ijjah*). The first of these meanings suits very well the Bethany in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem; the second, the one which was situated on the other side of the Jordan; and the passage in xi. 18 proves that the author knew the one as well as the other.[1]

The name of *Sychar*, which seems to be substituted for that of *Sichem* in iv. 5, may be explained in different ways. The LXX. already wrote the name of that town sometimes Σύχεμ, sometimes Σίκιμος or Σίκιμα. The permutation of the two liquids *m* and *r* was very much in use, especially in the popular language. It might have in that case an ironical meaning; for the word *Schéker*, signifying *lie*, might allude to the falsity of the Samaritan religion. But it is still more probable that *Sychar* and *Sichem* were two different places; the first being situated at the entrance of the pass, the second thirty minutes more to the west, in the centre of the valley. Quite close to Jacob's well, towards the north-east, is still found the small village of *Asgar*, whose name is not unrelated to that of Sychar.

The confusion of the name of *Cedron* (ὁ Κεδρών, *the black*) with that of *the torrent of the cedars* (τῶν Κεδρών), xviii. 1, is a mere mistake of the copyist. The true reading (τοῦ Κεδρών) is now positively settled.[2]

It is alleged that, in speaking of a locality named *Enon* (iii. 23), the author mistook that word, which merely meant *springs*, for a proper noun.[3] But that name has been found again in the Old Testament by Hengstenberg along with that of *Salim*, to which it is united in our narrative, by means of an ingenious combination which has not as yet been refuted. According to that explanation, those two localities, Enon and Salim, must have belonged to the most southern districts of Judea. It is commonly supposed that they ought to be placed on the confines of Samaria and Judea. In that case M. Renan finds precisely in that word "Enon" a flash of light. That Greek form in reality reproduces the Chaldean plural *Æinawan, fountains;* and the name which that locality bore

[1] Furrer, *Bibellexicon* of Schenkel, art. "Bethany."
[2] Tischendorf, 8th ed. *ad h. l.*
[3] M. Nicolas.

perfectly explains why John had betaken himself to that place in order to baptize. "How do you admit," M. Renan justly asks, "that Greek sectarians of Ephesus (to whom the Gospel is attributed) could have discovered that?" (p. 492).

The known distance from Capernaum to Cana (seven to eight leagues) agrees very well with the narrative in iv. 46 ff.; and that from the Jordan to Bethany (also seven to eight leagues) contains nothing that is inconsistent with the narrative of the resurrection of Lazarus.

What remains, then, of all the alleged topographical errors?

The complaints against the history are not more serious. That expression: "*the high priest that same year*" (xi. 49 and 51), which ought to prove, according to Baur, that in the eyes of the author Caiaphas alternated with Annas from year to year, as the two Roman consuls alternated, is simply intended, as Keim acknowledges, to bring out the exceptional importance of that year, and of the part played at that moment by the high priest; comp. xviii. 14. If, in chap. xviii., Annas and Caiaphas appear conjoined, it is in the capacity of *relations* (ver. 13) and not of *colleagues*. The mistake of the members of the Sanhedrim, who allege, in vii. 52, that no prophet had arisen out of Galilee, whilst Jonah and Nahum were from that province, may very well be reduced to an error of interpretation. For the true grammatical meaning is quite different from that which is usually given to it: "A prophet has not arisen (in the person of Jesus) in Galilee." But even if the ordinary meaning were the true one, what would there be to astonish us that, in a transport of violence, the members of the Sanhedrim should have forgotten the two or three Galilean prophets whose names could have been quoted?

Against these alleged errors we oppose an innumerable multitude of details dispersed throughout the course of the narrative, and which testify to the most exact and even most minute acquaintance, whether with the sacred topography, or with the customs, opinions, and the circumstances of the time.

The author is perfectly acquainted with Galilee. The green plateaus (in the spring-time) to the east of the Lake of Gennesareth seem to be before his eyes in vi. 10; he brings us back

from thence to Capernaum on the western side, in vi. 17, with a perfect knowledge of the localities. He knows that that journey can easily be made on foot by the northern shore (vi. 5 compared with ver. 22 and Mark vi. 33). The 25 to 30 stadia (three-quarters of a league) indicated in ver. 19 should, according to Matt. xiv. 24, be equivalent to *the half* of the basin, which it exactly is. He knows that it is necessary to *go down* in order to proceed from Cana to Capernaum (iv. 47). He is not ignorant that there are two Canas and two Bethsaidas, and he therefore takes care to add to those two names the complemental words: *of Galilee* (ii. 1, xii. 21). Similar acquaintance with Samaria. He so well describes (iv. 1–38) the situation of Jacob's well at the entrance of the valley of Sichem, the tomb of Joseph, the beautiful fields of corn which extend from that spot into the great valley of Mokna, finally Mount Gerizim, with the Samaritan worship which was there celebrated, that M. Renan says: "Only a Jew of Palestine who had often passed the entrance of the valley of Sichem could have written that."

The same remark may be applied to the indications relating to Judea; the number of stadia between Jerusalem and Bethany (xi. 18), the valley of Cedron and the garden of Gethsemane (xviii. 1), the pool of Siloam (ix. 7), the intermittent springs in the neighbourhood of the temple (v. 7), the gate of the city called the *sheep* gate (v. 2), the place in the temple where were situated the poor's boxes intended to receive offerings (viii. 20), Solomon's porch (x. 23), last of all Golgotha. A great number of those data are not to be met with in the Synoptics, and they consequently imply a personal acquaintance with the localities, or an independent and very exact tradition regarding the whole of that history. The circumstances of the period are likewise traced by a trustworthy hand. The number of years which the Jews had spent in the building of the temple down to the beginning of the ministry of Jesus (ii. 20), the addition of an eighth day to the feast of Tabernacles (vii. 37), the difference between the manner in which the Jews and the Egyptians embalmed dead bodies (xix. 40), and (xi. 44) the prohibition of all medical treatment on the Sabbath day, as well as the authority to perform circumcision on that day (ix. 14 and vii. 22),—all these

circumstances are familiar to him. He knows that a Rabbi does not enter into conversation with a woman (iv. 27); that a Jew contracts defilement by entering a pagan dwelling (xviii. 29); that a profound contempt rests on that portion of the people who had not received the Rabbinical teaching (vii. 49); that there were theological questions raised about the cause of hereditary maladies (ix. 2); that care was taken to remove all crucified bodies before the following day, especially when that was a Sabbath (xix. 31). He knows that numerous proselytes used to come and worship in the temple (xii. 20); that the sepulchres were closed with large stones (xi. 38 and xx. 1). He knows the Jewish custom of purifying themselves when they re-entered their dwellings (ii. 6); that of excommunication from the synagogue (ix. 22); the sale of cattle and the exchange established in the temple (ii. 14); the feast of Dedication, which is mentioned neither in the Old Testament nor in the Synoptics (x. 22). On the occasion of a circumstance which is peculiar to him, the breaking of the legs (xix. 31), M. Renan says: "The Jewish and the Roman archæology of that verse are exact." The author is in like manner very well informed on all the shades of Messianic expectation prevailing amongst the Jews. He knows that, according to received opinions, that appearance must be preceded by that of a prophet and of Elias (i. 21); that the origin of the Messiah would be altogether obscure (vii. 27); that to His reign was attributed an eternal duration, apparently incompatible with the idea of His death (xii. 34). He is acquainted with the much more spiritual character of Messianic expectation as it existed amongst the Samaritans (iv. 25 and 26), as well as the profound religious differences which separated them from the Israelites (iv. 9).[1] M. Renan likewise says with reason: "The too frequently repeated opinion, that our author is acquainted neither with Jerusalem nor Jewish matters, appears to me entirely devoid of foundation" (p. 522).

More closely examined, that first objection, derived from the historical and geographical errors, is transformed then into

[1] The greater part of the examples quoted have been borrowed from Luthardt, Beyschlag, and Schurer (*Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, passim): the latter furnishes proofs of the historical truth of most of these details.

a striking demonstration of the accuracy of the Johannine narrative, even in its minutest details.

2. Second objection: The Johannine Christ is a fanciful being, a speculative idea, that of the Logos; he does not possess the characteristics of a real human being. "He is not born," says Keim. The answer is not difficult: the fourth Gospel does not relate the birth of Jesus, as Matthew and Luke do, but it speaks on several occasions of His *mother* and His *brethren;* is not that enough? Mark, moreover, does not speak of the birth of Jesus, and yet no one accuses him on that account of denying and of *dehumanizing* the Lord. "He has not been baptized," continues Keim. The baptism undoubtedly is not related, but for a very simple reason: the author took the starting-point of his narrative subsequently to that event. But the scene of the baptism is none the less presupposed, and recalled in all the testimonies of John the Baptist. "He does not struggle." And yet in xii. 23 ff., at the thought of His death, aroused by the request of the Greeks, His soul *is troubled,* and in His anguish He no longer knows how He ought to pray. The cry of natural instinct is: "Father, save me from this hour" (ver. 27). But the voice of the Spirit strives against that instinctive dread of suffering, and ends by taking it away: "Father, glorify Thy name." In other words, "Cause me to go whithersoever Thou wilt, provided that even by my suffering Thou mayest be glorified." Could such be a Jesus without struggle?[1] In His last prayer for His own, xvii. 19, Jesus says: "For their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also may be truly sanctified."[2] It is then by an energetic action exercised upon Himself, and which is of the

[1] We know nothing more revolting in the department of criticism than the travesty of that sublime moment—the prelude to the scene of Gethsemane—by some of our modern savants. The evangelist is said to intend to put a stigma upon the prayer of Gethsemane in the Synoptics. The words of Jesus are said to signify, "Shall I say, Let that cup pass from me (*as I have been made to say elsewhere*)? By no means, for it is precisely for this hour that I have come." To maintain this incredible interpretation, it would be necessary to get rid of those words: "*And now is my soul troubled,*" which establish a perfect harmony between the sentiment of Jesus at that moment, and the prayer of Gethsemane. And it is really this which Scholten tries to do in wresting the meaning of the word *soul* so as to make it signify here the *sensual life.* But even in that arbitrary sense the internal struggle of Jesus remains, and this is that which it is sought to deny at any cost.

[2] French translation.

same nature as that which, one day after His example and in His strength, we must exert upon ourselves, that He works out the constant and progressive sacrifice of His entire person to the divine will and to His mission as Redeemer. What is there more human than that moral labour from which our own must proceed! Those last words: "I have overcome the world" (xvi. 33), well express the relief which He feels when at last He touches the limits of that lengthened struggle. "He does not suffer." And yet, at Jacob's well, He is worn out by fatigue; He asks for drink, doubtless not without experiencing the suffering of thirst. Throughout the whole narrative the author represents Jesus as a tenderly loving being: "Lord, he whom thou lovest is sick," xi. 3. "And Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus," xi. 5. "Having loved His own which were in the world, He loved them to the last degree," xiii. 1 (εἰς τέλος). He loves and does not suffer! He does not suffer when He weeps over the tomb of His friend! He does not suffer when on the cross He identifies Himself with the grief of the two beings whom His human heart has most tenderly loved, and when He bequeaths to each of them, in the affection of the other, the sweetest consolation! He does not suffer when He must leave behind Him, in the midst of a hostile world, those whom He has so dearly loved, and whom He urgently commends to His Father's protection! He does not suffer when His whole nature *shudders* at the thought of the traitor and his work of darkness. He whom the thought of His approaching suffering overwhelms with anguish and trouble does not suffer!

Strauss, Scholten, Hilgenfeld have here surpassed themselves in ingenious discoveries. According to Strauss, if Jesus *weeps* at the tomb, it is by no means through sympathy for those who surround Him, nor on account of the death of His friend, but on account of the stupidity of the Jews who could weep before Him, the Logos,—Him, the resurrection and the life. Hilgenfeld thinks that the *shuddering* of Jesus is that of the divine being within Him, which is indignant at the weakness of His humanity. Scholten approves.[1] Is anything else necessary save an appeal to good sense to repel these violent

[1] Strauss, *das Leben Jesu*, 1864, pp. 470–486; Hilgenfeld, *Einleitung*, p. 709; Scholten, *das Evang. nach Joh.*, pp. 112 and 217.

attempts of a criticism brought to bay? The Jews were less crafty, who ingenuously said: "Behold how He loved him!" Every man who consents to see what is, will recognise in this Jesus who *prays*, who is *subject to emotion*, who is *troubled*, who *shudders*, who *weeps*,—not an impassible Logos, not a marble statue in a niche, but *a man like to ourselves in all things*, although *without sin*, the Word really and seriously made *flesh*. "He knows everything," says Keim again; and Scholten in like manner: "There is no instance in that Gospel of Jesus learning anything by means of a communication" (p. 106). And, nevertheless, He hears of the sickness of Lazarus from a messenger; and on arriving at Bethany, He asks: "Where have ye laid him?" In ix. 35 we read, on the occasion of the excommunication of the man born blind: "And Jesus *heard* that they had cast him out;" and in xviii. 34 He addresses to Pilate that question, which is certainly not a *jeu d'esprit*: "Sayest thou this thing of thyself, or did others tell it thee of me?" In the temple He is for a moment ignorant how He ought to pray. What He possesses, then, according to our author, is not divine omniscience; it is a superior wisdom, analogous to that of the prophets, and which consequently by no means destroys the conditions of human life. The Synoptics say neither *less* nor *more* on this point. In them also Jesus foretells Peter's denial and the cock-crowing; He foretells to the two disciples, whom He sends to Jerusalem, their meeting with a man bearing a pitcher of water, etc. etc. Here is a knowledge similar to that of Elisha, when he said to Gehazi: "Went not mine heart with thee when thou wast talking with the Syrian?" "He can do all." And yet He *prays*, as we ourselves do. He expressly says v. 30: "I can of mine own self do nothing;" and in ver. 36: "The works which the Father hath *given me* to finish." At the very moment of the raising of Lazarus, He thanks His Father that He has agreed to grant Him that favour: "Father, I thank Thee that Thou hast heard me." In xiv. 18, He declares that His miracles are wrought "by the Father." It is only on that condition that in chap. v. He can term them the witness which the Father beareth of Him. But there is, above all, one decisive fact to which Beyschlag has called attention; and that is the manner in which Jesus prays for

His disciples as He sees the approach of death. Scholten alleges (p. 113) that when it is said: "He gave up the ghost," that phrase merely signifies that at the death of the body, the spirit within Him, the divine element, the Logos, returned to God, who is a Spirit. But if it were so, how could He not, from the midst of His own divine glory, Himself guard His disciples as well as the Father to whom He commends them? It was a state of powerlessness which was before His mind: "He should see them no more," xvi. 32. Death is for Him what it is for us, "the night when no man can work," ix. 4. Where is that condition of the Logos which renders human existence impossible?

It is said, finally, "He does not *become;* He *is* perfect." But we must not forget that the starting-point of this narrative of the life of Jesus is subsequent to the period of His development, properly so called, His childhood and youth, and even to the limit of that development—His baptism. We behold in our Gospel the tree, not at the period of its growth, but at the time when it is giving its fruits to the world, which does not, however, in a certain measure prevent its growth from being carried on. First of all, progress in his own moral development: "I sanctify myself,"—an expression which we have already explained, and which can only indicate a progress similar to that which must be wrought in us: "That they also may be sanctified in truth" (xvii. 19). Afterwards, progress from the point of view of His work; in that respect one word expresses all: "The Father loveth the Son, and showeth Him all things that Himself doeth: and He *will show Him greater works than these,* that ye may marvel" (v. 20). The Son walks like a child, hand in hand with His Father, who initiates Him into marvels of love towards mankind more and more amazing, and imparts to Him by degrees the power to do them. If, after such words, criticism is not satisfied, if it absolutely desires to establish a *transformation* in the ideas and principles of Jesus Himself, in order to prove Him to be a true man, we confess that we cannot, in the fourth Gospel, show a Jesus who answers to that demand. There is progress in the intuition of the truth, but of the truth already known; progress in the course of the work, but progress in the direction followed. If that is not enough, and if, for that reason, the

picture is not historical, then that of our three first Gospels is not so either. In the latter, as well as in the former, Jesus is fully conscious from the first day of His peculiar relation to His Father. This is proved by the scenes at the baptism ("Thou art *my* well beloved *Son*") and at the temptation ("If thou be *the Son*" . . .). Very far from rising from the consciousness of His Messianic charge to that of His filial relationship to God, it is the latter which, as a religious fact, is the first and immediate object of His feeling (Luke ii. 49, iii. 22, iv. 3); the certainty of His theocratic dignity is only the corollary of His consciousness that He is the Son of God. And it is with a settled conviction on those two points that He commences His public ministry in the Synoptics as in the Johannine narrative. Weizsäcker[1] has shown, in like manner, how all the first acts of Jesus in the Synoptics—the preaching of the kingdom, the election of the Twelve, the attitude taken by Him in the Sermon on the Mount, etc.—imply the settled conviction of His dignity as Messiah. It is false, then, to maintain that the theory of the Logos has in this respect in any way changed the image of the historical Christ. The same observation may be made regarding the prevision of His death and resurrection. Jesus, in the fourth Gospel, foretells these facts from the outset (ii. 19, iii. 14). But does He not do the same likewise in the Synoptics? Does He not declare, at the very beginning of His sojourn at Capernaum, that "the bridegroom shall be taken away" from the disciples? How is it possible here to mistake the distinct presentiment of His death, and of His violent death?[2] And if Jesus foresaw His death, why could He not have looked forward to His resurrection? Was it not that event which, on the supposition of death, could alone give back to the Messianic community the bridegroom of which it was deprived? The same prophecies which had given Him a presentiment of one of these events announced to Him the other also. Once more, then, on this point, if the Synoptic narrative is supposed to be true, the Johannine narrative is unassailable.

[1] P. 423 ff.

[2] Mark ii. 19 ff. and the parallel passages. The first aorist passive ἀπαρθῇ, Mark, ver. 20, signifies: taken away by a violent blow, and implies in the victim the most entire passiveness.

It is maintained that there is yet to be found another trace of the injurious influence of the idea of the Logos on the Johannine narrative. There are certain omissions, such as that of the temptation, of the agony in Gethsemane, and of the institution of the holy supper. The two first scenes must have been omitted as unworthy of the divine Logos; the omission of the third would proceed from the anti-Judaic tendencies of the author,—from his desire to remove from the last supper of Christ the character of a paschal feast.[1] But the author has likewise omitted the three accounts of the calling of the Twelve, of the transfiguration, and of the ascension. Is that because those scenes appeared to him unworthy of the divine Logos? Or will some one succeed in discovering in these omissions some trace of anti-Judaism? He does more. If he does not reproduce the three narratives indicated above, which he is accused of systematically suppressing, he does not fail, notwithstanding, to disclose the substance of them. Thus, as regards the temptation, in those words (xiv. 30), "The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me;" as to Gethsemane, in that scene in chap. xii. which we have already analysed, and which was the prelude, neglected by tradition, of the scene of agony fully described in the Synoptics; as for the holy supper, in the very remarkable discourse of chap. vi. on the text: "Whoso eateth not my flesh and drinketh not my blood, hath not eternal life,"—a discourse which presented to the church the spiritual basis for the institution of the Holy Supper. And of what avail, then, in order to discredit that ceremony, would have been the silence in the second century of an anonymous writer regarding that rite which rested on the most positive tradition (1 Cor. xi.), and which was already celebrated in all churches spread abroad under heaven? It would be his own narrative which the author would have discredited by that omission, if it had had that polemical meaning. Let us add, moreover, in regard to the temptation, that the starting-point of the narrative (i. 19) is subsequent to that fact as well as to that of the baptism. As to Gethsemane, that the passage, xviii. 1: "When Jesus had spoken these words, He went forth with His disciples over the brook Cedron, *where was a garden*," contains a perfectly dis-

[1] Scholten, p. 286.

tinct reference to that scene,—a reference as distinct as that which ver. 24 contains to the scene of the condemnation of Jesus in the house of Caiaphas by the Sanhedrim, likewise omitted by John. Finally, as respects the Holy Supper, that the evangelist proceeds absolutely in the same manner with respect to the baptism, the institution of which he does not relate, but the substance of which he makes known (iii. 5), and that, moreover, in spite of that silence, he expressly confirms it as a Christian rite (iv. 2). Dogmatic motives being then excluded, there only remains to apply here the same motive for omission which we have established for so many other facts, when we have demonstrated the fragmentary character of our narrative. That very simple reason is nothing else than the knowledge which the author supposes his hearers to possess of the whole of the evangelical tradition, oral or written, and the idea of the Logos is consequently entirely foreign to those omissions.

And if it is objected to this explanation that the author sometimes reproduces facts related in the Synoptics, as, for instance, the multiplication of the loaves, the entry into Jerusalem, the denial of Peter, the exegesis will show that it is in order to place them in their true light, and because they entered as indispensable factors into the pragmatism of his narrative.

3. It is not only in the person of Jesus, it is likewise in the apostles and throughout the whole work of Jesus, that *the absence of development*, of progress, is noted. Andrew, John, Philip, and Nathanael are found to have attained on the very first day to the possession of entire faith in the Messianic character of Jesus. But is not that also the feeling under the dominion of which, in the Synoptics, the disciples attach themselves to Jesus from the first, and yield themselves to His service? That does not exclude progress. Their faith, after having had for a while the character of a mere presentiment, or of a belief on authority, based on the foundation of the testimony of John the Baptist and of that of Jesus Himself, gains strength and becomes more conscious of itself in the struggle with the contradictory judgments of the people, and in the midst of experiences so discouraging in the ministry of Jesus. It acquires more and more the character of a

victory proper, of a personal conviction, joyous, immoveable, of a faith of experience in intimate intercourse with Jesus; and it is under this form that it finally asserts itself by the mouth of Peter at the moment of the general falling away described in chap. vi., and which corresponds so well to that of the conversation at Cesarea Philippi in the Synoptics (Matt. xvi. 13 ff. and parallel passages): "To whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life! And we believe and are sure that Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (vv. 68, 69). Is there not there a real progress on the authoritative and instinctive faith of the earlier days? A higher degree than the former is clearly pointed out by the narrative of the fourth Gospel, at the moment of the last evening when the disciples, as if dazzled by a new light, exclaimed: "Now are we sure that Thou knowest all things; and we believe that Thou camest forth from God" (xvi. 30). They confess Jesus no longer as the Christ (chap. i.), or as the Holy One of God (chap. vi.), but as a being come from God; and Jesus answers them, "Now, then, ye believe." Finally, the invocation of Thomas, chap. xx. 28, indicates the fourth and last stage in that development, the moment when the faith of the disciples perfectly responds to the nature of His person: "My Lord and my God!" And yet there is no progress in that Gospel. Between the words of Nathanael: "Thou art the Son of God, the King of Israel," and that of Thomas, there is all the distance which separates the faith of the infant Christian, on whose eyes has just shone the first ray of the glory of Jesus, and the faith of the full-made man in Christ, which has overcome all the attacks of unbelief, accepted without wavering the haughty judgments of science, been matured through the frequent and painful experiences of a life of struggles, and which is summed up in these words: "Thou art mine, and I am thine." Where shall we find so clearly marked a progress in the Synoptics?

As to progress in the march of the narrative in general, it is sufficient to read over again the exposition which we have presented of the contents of the Gospel; the movement which urges on the history to its *dénoûement*, and the phases through which it passes in order to reach it, are stated with a precision which leaves nothing to be desired. Let us quote here only this feature: In Mark the progress is in some sort

geographical. From Capernaum, as a centre, Jesus makes a series of rounds of evangelization in all directions, the radius of which extends farther and farther, and the last of which finally terminates at Jerusalem. The type of historical development is quite different in Luke. Here the progress consists in the internal growth of the work itself. Jesus at first draws to Himself simple *believers;* He then attaches to Himself a certain number of these as permanent *disciples;* from the midst of these He selects twelve, whom He names *apostles;* the day comes when He sends them forth for the first time as evangelists; soon He adds to them, from amongst the other disciples, seventy assistants; finally, He draws away all that missionary church along with Him to Jerusalem, which thus becomes the starting-point of the work of evangelization to the whole world, such as is described in the Book of the Acts. Such is the admirable plan of Luke's narrative. In Matthew we find rather a systematic grouping; five grand discourses forming, as it were, the peaks of the narrative, separated by groups of homogeneous facts and reunited by categories.

Is it possible to compare, in point of depth, one of these plans with that of the Johannine narrative,—a plan based, as we have seen, on the simultaneous development of unbelief and of faith towards the increasing revelation of the person of Jesus, and which thus ends directly in the catastrophe, as the fatal *dénoûement* of this tragical conflict? And at the same time that this last intuition is the most profound, it is likewise the most manifestly historical. Let there be an end, then, to the talk about a want of progress in our Gospel! It is in this narrative alone that the spiritual movement is disclosed to us, and thereby the true course of the history of Jesus.

4. We come to one of the most important objections: the *contradictions* between the Synoptic narrative and that of the fourth Gospel. They turn: (1) On the general outline of the ministry of Jesus; (2) On certain more or less important details. The general difference is known. We have already pointed it out. In the Synoptics, a continuous sojourn in Galilee, without journeys to Jerusalem, and a single final sojourn at Jerusalem at the last Passover; so that it might be

imagined, and has, indeed, been admitted, that according to that narrative the entire ministry of the Lord lasted only a single year, and that it had been almost entirely spent in Galilee. According to John, five journeys to Jerusalem (or even six, if we reckon the visit to Bethany as one, chap. xi.), which leads us, on account of the feasts of the Passover mentioned in chap. ii., vi., and xii., to extend the duration of the ministry of Jesus to at least two and a half years. That is the principal difference. It may be explained in two ways: either the Synoptics present the primitive and historical type, and the fourth evangelist, under the empire of an idea which is peculiar to him (the desire of depicting the struggle of the Light, represented by the Logos, with the darkness, represented by the Jews of Jerusalem), has arbitrarily transformed the history; or else the primitive tradition, of which the Synoptics are the redaction, had summed up in two great, compact historic masses the two chief aspects of the activity of Jesus,—His work in Galilee, and His death in Judea,—and, omitting all the secondary circumstances, had opposed to each other these two great tableaux; whilst the fourth evangelist, an eye-witness of the facts, and drawing on his personal recollections, has re-established the true history, by restoring to it all its natural articulations, suppressed in the popular preaching of the Gospel. That is so fundamental a question, that we must make it the decisive touchstone for the appreciation of the historical character of the narrative of the fourth Gospel. In the first case, the Johannine narrative is proved to be fictitious, not only in general, but in detail; for, as Keim boldly says: "He who is faithless in the principal matter will be so likewise in minor ones." In the second case, the superiority of the Johannine narrative is demonstrated, and it is proved that that Gospel is not the work of an audacious dogmatism, but that it rests on a very accurate acquaintance, whether personal or traditional, with the history of Jesus.

We ought to thank M. Sabatier[1] for having been the first in France to show the intermediate position which the Gospel of Luke occupies in this respect. Whilst, in the Gospels of Matthew and of Mark, Jesus proceeds from Galilee to Jerusalem by way of Perea, and that directly and

[1] *Essai sur les sources*, etc., p. 30 ff.

without halting, we find in Luke, at that same moment, the narrative of a lengthened journey in the southern parts of Galilee, which fills up ten chapters—that is to say, more than a third of the Gospel. That indication proves that the ministry of Jesus was not exclusively Galilean, as might have been supposed from Matthew and Mark. There is here an important extension of the primitive traditional framework.

It may doubtless be said, with many of our modern critics, that this transformation of the primitive framework is only the fruit of the legend which goes on progressing. John might pursue this path, and entirely break up the primordial type by placing the centre of gravity of Jesus' ministry in His activity at Jerusalem. But we may likewise see in Luke's narrative a first rectification, of a truly historical kind, of that which was in some measure too narrow, and too massive in the primitive narrative; and John's narrative would appear from that point of view as a complete return to the reality of the history. M. Renan adopts this second way of looking at it: "Certain passages of Luke," he says, "moreover, prove that the traditions preserved by the fourth Gospel were not for the rest of the Christian family, something altogether unheard of" (p. 80). How shall we arrive at a clear view on so decisive a point as this?

We have three means of so doing. The first is to consult historical probability. Is it probable, is it possible, that Jesus, regarding Himself as the Messiah, should have devoted a year to the remote province of Galilee without once visiting Jerusalem, the theocratic capital? To act thus, was it not to disown His Messianic character at the very moment when He was bearing witness to it by His teaching and by His acts? Besides, how are we to explain the tears which He shed, according to Luke xix., over the incurable blindness of Jerusalem and its impending chastisement, if He had never raised His voice in the midst of it? What, six days of appeal only, and all is ended! What do I say? *two* days, and the fig-tree is cursed! Jerusalem condemned! Such a Messianic ministry is not conceivable. Keim, no doubt, urges that if Jesus had sooner come into collision with the theocratic authorities, He could not have maintained Himself for a whole year against "the great waters of the hierarchy." But Luthardt justly

replies to him, that the waters did not rise to such a height in one day, and that a certain time was needed to allow them to increase to the point of submerging Him. "Is the account given by our historian," says M. Renan, "not much more probable than that in the Synoptic Gospels, which only make the plot of the Jews against Jesus begin two or three days before His death?" (p. 514). The national festivals, which periodically reassemble the whole people at Jerusalem, and to which Jesus, like every Jew, was bound to repair, were for Him the most favourable opportunity for putting Himself in communication, not only with the Jews of Palestine, but with those of the whole world; and the more that the former proved themselves rebels, so much the more must it have been important for Him to exert His influence over the latter. And would He voluntarily have neglected these rare opportunities for a whole year? Had Jesus only been in relation with the mass of the people during the last three or four days of His life, the establishment of the Judeo-Christian church would be incomprehensible. Criticism reproaches our evangelist with omitting gradations; but it is precisely he who, in respect to that central point, as in a multitude of particular instances, has alone preserved them. Keim and Mangold further object, that Jesus would have acted very imprudently in endangering His work by fruitless attempts at Jerusalem before He had established it in the hearts of the Galilean believers. But the care which Jesus took of His work could not admit of His neglecting the indispensable conditions for its fulfilment,—Jesus knew that in His day were *twelve hours*, and that not one of them would be taken away from Him by the malice of men (xi. 9), and that with Him prudence would never be prejudicial to decision.

Strauss himself has been forced to allow, on one occasion, the superiority of John's narrative on this point;[1] and Hausrath and Holtzmann do the same at the present day.[2]

The second means of deciding is to be found in certain deeds and certain words of Jesus preserved in the Synoptic narratives themselves. Thus, Luke x. 38 ff., two sisters

[1] *Leben Jesu*, 3d Ausg., i. p. 506.

[2] *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, i. p. 386; *Gesch. d. Volks Israel*, ii. pp. 372, 373.

named Martha and Mary are spoken of, who received Jesus into their house. The town where they dwelt is not mentioned; it seems, according to the context, that it must have been situated in Galilee; and yet we cannot doubt that they resided in Judea, if, at least, the account in chap. xi. of our Gospel is not a pure romance. Here, then, is a trace of Jesus passing into Judea during the course of His ministry. The Synoptic Gospels inform us, that on drawing nigh to Bethphage Jesus desired a request to be made to a family for the beast, of "which He had need" for His entrance into Jerusalem; He requested for His last meal a room in the house of one of the inhabitants of the town. In these two instances He designates Himself as *the Lord*, and appears to know that He was recognised as such. The anointing, which took place at Bethany, proves that there He possessed attached friends. Jesus must have had personal relations with Joseph of Arimathea. All these facts imply previous sojourns in that country. Certain words bring us to the same result. Baur has vainly sought to turn away from its natural meaning that apostrophe of Jesus, quoted in Matt. xxiii. 37 and in Luke xiii. 34: "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; *how often* would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not!" The children of Jerusalem can only be its inhabitants, and not, as Baur alleges, the whole Israelitish nation. And even to suppose that this latter explanation were admissible, it could only be on one condition, and that is, that the inhabitants of Jerusalem should not be excluded from the circle of persons so designated, but should be included in it, and *potior pars*, as it were. If they were excluded, the explanation offered would be absurd; Strauss himself has said, in speaking of Baur's attempt: "All subterfuges here are useless; and if Jesus really uttered those words, we can only admit that He must have exercised His activity at Jerusalem for a longer period, and more frequently than appears from the Synoptic Gospels." So he proposes another remedy. According to him, those words were borrowed by tradition from a lost work, in which the divine wisdom had caused one of the ancient prophets to express himself in that fashion. It is unnecessary to say that

such a work is a pure fiction of Strauss, invented to meet the necessities of the case. But even if something similar had occurred, still it was necessary, as Luthardt observes, that some well-known fact in the life of Jesus should have furnished an occasion for attributing to Him such words,—a circumstance which implies the reality of His sojourns at Jerusalem. Keim has devised another expedient. He recalls first the personal relations which Jesus had had in Galilee with several of the inhabitants of Jerusalem; then he thinks he can find (Matt. xix. 1–20) indications of a prolonged sojourn by Jesus in Judea. But in the latter passage it is Perea that is in question, and in any case Judea would not be Jerusalem. As to the personal relations of Jesus during His Galilean ministry, what have they to do with that collective expression: *the children of Jerusalem*, that is to say, the whole population of the capital. Here, then, in the Synoptic tradition itself, there are undeniable traces of a multiplicity of sojourns at Jerusalem. Finally, we have to ask ourselves which is the most probable supposition: this, that our evangelist has broken up the single visit of Jesus to Jerusalem into a multiplicity of sojourns; or else that the popular narrative has gradually reunited all these journeys into one single summary statement, that of the last sojourn, such as we read of in the Synoptics? We find the second procedure in a multitude of particular instances. The two first sojourns of Jesus in Judea before John's imprisonment had been blended into one. The three phases of St. Peter's denial are reunited into a single narrative, followed in the Synoptics, so as to form one of the features of the history of Jesus, such as they were related in the churches; whilst in John these three phases are related separately, and intercalated in their place in the general account of the trial of Jesus.[1] It is the same in the narrative of the revelation of the traitor during the last supper. It forms a single whole (one of the traditional *ἀπομνημονεύματα*) in the Synoptics, whilst all the natural articulations of the fact appear in the Gospel of John. Such must naturally be the product of traditional elaboration, and its relation to the

[1] M. Renan has fully felt this: "Same superiority," he says, "in the narrative of Peter's denials. All that episode in our author is more circumstantial, better explained."

vivid reminiscences of the eye-witness. It is by the same process that the different journeys to Jerusalem are blended into one single great festive journey, which is placed as a single whole, against the different phases of the Galilean ministry gathered together into one continuous sojourn. The narrative of a witness was needed to give to the history its shades and its varied aspects, such as are involved in the real course of events. On this central point it seems to us, then, that no doubt can exist, and that the true type of the ministry of Jesus can only be, in the eyes of the impartial historian, that which has been preserved to us in the fourth Gospel. M. Renan, in like manner, declares that the mention of the different journeys of Jesus to Jerusalem "constitutes for our Gospel a decisive triumph" (p. 487).

With this question is closely connected that of the *duration* of the public ministry of Jesus. Keim urgently maintains that that ministry could only have included one year. He takes his stand on the Synoptics; but the latter leave the question altogether undecided, because they do not mention the journeys to the feasts, which in John are the landmarks of the narrative. Nevertheless, the trait of the apostles plucking the ripe ears of grain (Luke vi. 1 ff. and parallel passages) evidently supposes a spring-time spent in Galilee, a spring which corresponds to the feast of the Passover in John vi. All that precedes that fact in the Synoptics must consequently be added to that last year. And if, according to the Synoptics themselves, the ministry of Jesus could not then have lasted less than one and a half to two years, it becomes more and more inconceivable that during so long a period Jesus should have completely refrained from appearing at Jerusalem. To the historical reasons which we have just urged may be added one more weighty, admirably developed by Weizsäcker (p. 313), and which is deduced from the indispensable conditions of the education of the apostles. "The conduct of Jesus," says that writer, "was from the outset full of reserve, and never had in view a sudden decision. We may especially remark in it a very graduated progress in the education of His disciples, and a work of such a nature could not be effected in a few months merely. The transformation in their ideas, their intuitions, their preceding beliefs, must penetrate to the very core to be

able to survive the final catastrophe (the death of Jesus), and immediately to start up anew. Such a change could not be the effect of sudden impressions, it must have been prepared for. For such a result there was needed the teaching arising from prolonged intercourse with the Master. Neither instructions nor emotions were enough; growth into an internal and personal union with Jesus was necessary."

If such is the case, it becomes very easy to establish harmony between our Gospel and the Synoptics. We have already seen how all the matter of the Galilean ministry contained in the latter can easily find a place in the three months which separate chap. iv. and chap. v. of John, in the month supposed between chap. v. and vi., in the long interval of seven months between chap. vi. and vii., and finally in the three months which separate chap. vii. from x. 22. Certainly the facility with which that harmony is established is not one of the least proofs of the fidelity of the fourth Gospel. Once the truly historical character of John's narrative is established on this fundamental point, the scene and the duration of the ministry of Jesus, it is not difficult to show how the same superiority belongs to that narrative in all the particular points on which it is at variance with the statements of its predecessors.

And first of all: the two accounts of the call of the disciples. That of John places this event in Judea, where these young Galileans happened to be with the forerunner (chap. i.), whilst the Synoptists place it in Galilee (Matt. iv. 18 and parallel passages). The Synoptic narrative here leaves much to be desired. It appears that it was the first time that Jesus met the four young fishermen; but we do not understand in that case how they abandon their trade and even their family (Peter was married) at the first summons. That way of acting supposes a relation of some kind already contracted. Now that blank is exactly filled up by John's narrative. The young men had known Jesus whilst they were with the forerunner, who had accredited Him in their eyes as the Messiah. They had returned with Him to Galilee, then gone back, for the moment, precisely as He Himself had done (John ii. 12), to the bosom of their families; and the moment approached when they must leave all to accompany Him definitively, and follow

Him to Jerusalem, whither He went to begin His work.[1] The Synoptic narrative, in accordance with its popular destination, only gives the external *result;* the Johannine narrative recalls the less known origin of the external facts, and initiates us into their inmost source. That remarkable relation between the two narratives, which is everywhere met with, is an unequivocal proof of the truth of John's statements.

A second difference: almost an entire year added by our Gospel to the beginning of the ministry of Jesus, and prior to the Galilean activity described by the Synoptics. But here again we easily convince ourselves of the excellence of the Johannine narrative. It is demonstrated by two very independent critics, Weizsäcker and Holtzmann. The first observes that the imprisonment of John the Baptist, with which the Synoptic Gospels connect the beginning of the Galilean ministry, could not induce Jesus to withdraw into that province except on one condition, which was, that He had Himself already begun to teach publicly either in Judea or Perea; because it was only on that account that the same danger of persecution could threaten Him.[2] The second remarks that in any case there exists in the Synoptic narrative a chasm between the baptism of Jesus by John the Baptist and the imprisonment of the latter, and that it is precisely that chasm which we find filled up by the mention of that simultaneous ministry of John and of Jesus which is recorded in our Gospel.[3] Finally, the express rectification of the Synoptic narrative in the remark, iii. 24, "For John was not yet cast into prison," proves that the author of our Gospel felt himself in possession of an undisputed and indisputable knowledge of the facts. Would he otherwise have allowed himself thus to criticise received tradition, and writings already admitted into the churches?

We pass on to the most important difference: that which relates to the day of Christ's death. According to the Synop-

[1] We may thus perhaps find in John the explanation of the anomaly which is presented (Luke iv. 23) by the mention of miracles performed at Capernaum, but which had not been reported by the evangelist any more than the sojourn of Jesus in that town. These events had occurred at the previous date indicated in John ii. 12.

[2] P. 309.

[3] *Geschichte des Volks Israel*, ii. p. 272.

tics, that event appears to have taken place during the course of the 15th Nisan, the first and great day of the Paschal feast, a holy and Sabbatical day, which, according to the Jewish mode of reckoning, began with the preceding evening and opened with the Paschal feast. According to John's narrative, Jesus died on the day of the 14th, the eve and preparation of the great day of the feast; and the last meal which He celebrated with His disciples took place, not on the evening when the Paschal feast was kept, but twenty-four hours before, on the night of the 13th. Baur and his school (Hilgenfeld, Keim, Scholten) think that the author of our Gospel has thus modified history according to his own fancy. In his anti-Judaical zeal, he wished to make out that Jesus is Himself the true Paschal Lamb, and that the Passover is entirely abolished. It is with this dogmatic intention that he has, on his own responsibility, overturned the chronology of the narrative of the Passion, which we have learned from the Synoptics. But let us first of all observe that we should have here a process of audacity difficult to conceive. To change, under the empire of an idea, and in a perfectly conscious manner, the central fact of the religion which one professes, would be an act of historical brutality which I believe to be without example.

In the second place, that violent process would have been useless. The whole church, at the time when the Gospel was composed, already admitted that Jesus was substituted in the holy supper for the Paschal lamb. That was the meaning of these words: "Do this in remembrance" (no longer of the Paschal lamb, but) "*of me.*" St. Paul had long since said, "Christ, *our Passover*, is sacrificed for us" (1 Cor. v. 7); he, that Paul, whom Keim nevertheless cites as a witness in favour of the Synoptic narrative. That symbolism existed then in the consciousness of the church, independently of the question of knowing whether the day of Christ's death had or had not coincided with that of the sacrifice of the lamb; and it was quite superfluous to change the history of the Passion to establish a typology which was a commonplace for Christians. As to the abolition of the Paschal feast in the church, that was an already accomplished fact; and if it was against the holy supper itself that the author had a de-

sign, that unheard-of attempt could not obviously succeed by means so indirect.[1]

But there is more. We think that we can maintain that there is no contradiction between the two narratives regarding that date of the death of Jesus.[2] That of John is simply clearer, more precise, intended to remove a misunderstanding which might easily arise from a superficial reading of the Synoptic narrative. Finally,—and here is the decisive fact, —if a conflict really existed, it would certainly be in John's favour that it ought to be decided.

As a matter of fact: 1st. The Talmud, which is very impartial on that question, testifies in favour of the fourth Gospel. The Mishna expressly says[3] that Jesus was hanged (crucified) on the evening of the Passover, *beérev happésach* (בערב הפסח),— an expression which can only denote the afternoon, the *eve* of the great Paschal day; thus the 14th and not the 15th Nisan. In like manner, the expression, *beerev schabbath, the evening of the Sabbath,* denotes, not the afternoon of Saturday, but that of Friday. 2d. The Synoptics themselves give evidence in favour of the Johannine narrative. It is absolutely impossible, whatever may be said, according to the law and customs of the Jews, that during the solemn night of the Passover and the Sabbatical day which followed it, there could have taken place at least two meetings of the courts, the one in the house of Caiaphas, the other in that of Pilate; that Simon should have returned from working in the fields (it is alleged, it is true, that he had been taking a walk!); and that on that day of the 15th, which was itself Sabbatical, the women should have hastened to prepare spices, "because the Sabbath drew on" (as is related, Luke xxiii. 56).[4]

[1] We do not here examine the relation of John's chronology with the Passover controversies in the second half of the second century; that will be considered apart.

[2] This we believe we have proved in our *Commentaries* on John's Gospel (1st ed.) and on Luke's Gospel.

[3] Treatise, *Sanhedrim.* Keim (iii. p. 472) questions the value of that testimony. He quotes the words of Bäumlein: "It would be strange to prefer the testimony of the Jews to that of our Synoptics." In themselves those words prove nothing. And what would it be if the testimony of the Synoptic Gospels, rightly understood, agreed with the Talmud as well as with that of John? Such is our conviction.

[4] The Talmud says, *Bezah* v. 2 (Schürer, p. 489): "Every action which is re-

To these facts let us add the following words: in Matt. xxvi. 18, Jesus bids His disciples say to the host whom He has chosen at Jerusalem, "My time is at hand. I will keep the Passover at thy house with my disciples." What would be the logical connection between these two propositions, if the first did not signify that Jesus intended this time to anticipate the celebration of the Passover, because the evening of the next day would be too late for Him? In Matt. xxvii. 62, it is said: "The next day (of the crucifixion), *that followed the day of the preparation*, the chief priests came together." The day of the punishment was then *the preparation*, which in the context can only signify *the preparation of the feast*, and not, as it has been attempted to understand it, the preparation *of the Sabbath*,—that is to say, Friday. 3d. We can very easily understand how in the tradition a confusion has been introduced between the evening when Jesus celebrated His last supper, which, on account of the institution of the Holy Supper, had been invested with a Paschal character, and the following evening, when the Jews legally celebrated the sacred feast. This misunderstanding probably existed in the minds of many persons, from the very fact that the Synoptic statement is not sufficiently precise on that point; and the author of the fourth Gospel has corrected it, as he had already corrected other analogous misapprehensions. So that on this point also the superiority of the Johannine narrative seems confirmed by all the means of review which are at our disposal.

There remains a last point for examination. Keim maintains that the catastrophe of the death of Jesus is explained by John quite differently from the Synoptics. As he had already, more than once in the course of this narrative, brought the Lord to the fatal limit, all the motives requisite to explain that *dénoûement* were exhausted, and consequently it was necessary to invent a new one. Hence the fiction of the resurrection of Lazarus, which, in driving the Jewish authorities to extre-

prehensible on the Sabbath day is equally so on a festival day, such as to climb a tree, to clap one's hands, to dance, *to hold a meeting of a court*; all that is not allowable on a festival day, still less on that of the Sabbath." Josephus, in like manner, declares that on the Sabbath and on *festival days* it is contrary to Jewish customs to travel, to take up arms, or to attend to business (*Antiq.* xiii. 8. 4; *Bell. Jud.* iv. 2. 3).

mities, supplies John with the motive which he requires to explain the condemnation and execution of Jesus. This complaint against John's narrative is skilfully devised, but it is not difficult to refute. According to the fourth Gospel, the resurrection of Lazarus is so little the real cause of the death of Jesus, that already in chap. v. the Jewish authorities plot against Him as a Sabbath-breaker and blasphemer. The whole Gospel is the exposition of the growing conflict which must lead to this result. The part of the resurrection of Lazarus in the *dénoûement* is therefore only occasional and indirect. In exalting the enthusiasm of the people, that deed helps to bring about the scene of Palm Sunday, and it is the latter which irresistibly brought on the decision of the rulers (xii. 18, 19). What is more soundly historical than such an exposition? Who does not know that, when an issue in some way fatal is hovering over a situation, it needs only a blow to break the thread which held it suspended, and to cause it to fall into the domain of realities? The decisive blow was in this case the entry of Jesus on Palm Sunday; and the extraordinary splendour of that entry is due to the resurrection of Lazarus. Such is the relation which John establishes between the events. It is so natural, that it bears in itself its own justification. M. Renan feels this perfectly. "In all this portion of the life of Jesus," he says, "the fourth Gospel contains special information infinitely superior to that of the Synoptics. Now, strange matter! the narrative of the resurrection of Lazarus is connected with these last pages by ties so close that, if it be rejected as imaginary, the whole edifice of the last weeks of the life of Jesus, so substantial in our Gospel, crumbles at the same stroke" (p. 514).

Whether, then, it be a question of the general framework or of the particular events, the historical superiority of John's narrative cannot escape an unprejudiced mind.

It is customary for the school of Tübingen to speak of the dependence of the fourth Gospel on the Synoptic narrative. All the facts common to the two accounts must have been borrowed by the author of our Gospel from the statements of the three others; he could not himself possess any proper knowledge of the history of Jesus; that which he adds must

be merely fictitious. If he portrays the character of Martha and Mary, as he does in chap. xi., it is only an amplification of the picture drawn by Luke x. 38 ff. If he puts in the mouth of Philip the number of 200 pence, vi. 7, and in that of Judas that of 300 pence, xii. 5, it is a copy of Mark vi. 37 and xiv. 5, etc.[1]

Certainly the whole of the preceding exposition proves that the author of our Gospel knew the Synoptic narrative; that, as Hilgenfeld has said, he makes it the implicit foundation of his own, and that consequently he, in a general way, recog-

[1] Holtzmann has even written (*Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1869) a complete work to prove that John's narrative is borrowed even as to the expressions from the Synoptic narrative. Thus the words: "*there was a man*" (ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος), i. 6, must be derived from Luke iii. 2: "*the word of God came unto John*" (ἐγένετο ῥῆμα θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἰ.); the words: "*the same came*" (οὗτος ἦλθεν), i. 7, from Luke iii. 3: "and he came" (καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς), and so on; so that the most original writing, in point of style and turn of mind, which exists in the world, the fourth Gospel, would be stuffed with phrases and bits of expressions copied just as they are from the Synoptics! Such assertions we do not refute. The masterpiece of this method is the explanation of the resurrection of Lazarus, such as we read it in Holtzmann, p. 450. The words: "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth; but I go that I may awake him" (John xi. 11), must be taken, as Scholten thinks, from Mark v. 39 and parallel passages: "She is not dead, but sleepeth." The Greek expression, it is true, is different (κεκοίμηται instead of καθεύδει); but may we not suppose that that was an innocent method of disguising the loan? The illness of Lazarus must have been imitated, as Zeller has supposed, from Luke xvi. 20, where the sickness of the poor Lazarus, laid at the rich man's gate, is spoken of. Here is the expression: "*a beggar named Lazarus*," Luke xvi. 20, which must have served as a model for those of John xi. 1: "*A certain man was sick, named Lazarus.*" It is not asked if there is any relation between the situation of Lazarus tenderly cared for by his two sisters in his home, and the unfortunate man forsaken on the street! But here is the relation which is proved: The Lazarus of the parable is full of sores (Luke xvi. 20), which marvellously recalls the epithet of leper given in John to Lazarus! No, not so; but to Simon, at whose house, according to Mark xiv. 3 and Matt. xxvi. 6, the repast of Bethany was offered to Jesus. Does not leprosy manifest itself by sores? It is only forgotten, in here establishing the relation between leprosy and sores, that the leper was excluded from towns, and that Lazarus, in Luke, is laid at the rich man's gate! Another reference which is not less obvious: The Synoptic Gospels relate the history of a leper who was healed by Jesus. Now lepers are the dead in full life, which recalls the dead Lazarus restored to life. Then lepers remain outside of towns; what a striking agreement with Lazarus laid in his tomb outside of Bethany! See what this so much vaunted criticism has come to. It moves now-a-days in the shallows of the most paltry puerilities. If we would draw a parallel between the two Lazarus', there would have been one feature to bring forward: the harmony between the words of Jesus, "Neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead," and the slight effect produced on the Jews by the resurrection of Lazarus. But

nised its accuracy.[1] But it results also from all this examination that he assumes a lofty position over the other narrative; that he appreciates it freely; that he places himself before it, not as a scholar, but as a judge; and that he is competent to take such a position. As M. Renan admits: "he has his own tradition for *himself*,—a tradition *parallel* with that of the Synoptics" (p. 530). His narrative winds in some sort across the three others, supplementing, omitting, explaining, correcting, advancing on this common ground like a planet which traverses space while remaining independent of the rest, but for all that united in its progress, by the laws of gravitation, with all its travelling companions in the firmament.

5. The objection deduced from the miracles of the fourth Gospel bears, in the first place, on the manner in which they surpass the analogous wonders related in the Synoptics; and, in the second place, on the miracles in themselves. The miracle of Cana is more wonderful than all that the Synoptics narrate. The cure of the man born blind surpasses that of the simply blind: the resurrection of Lazarus surpasses that of the daughter of Jairus, etc. But in passing that judgment, are we not arrested by the contradiction which would exist between the materialism of a similar religious tendency and the highly spiritualistic character which cannot be mistaken in our evangelist, and that very specially in the way in which he appreciates the value of miracles for the formation of faith? He refuses to a faith founded on prodigies the title of faith. He regards that means of conviction only as a makeshift for those on whom the character of the teachings and the holiness of Jesus do not make a sufficient impression (xiv. 11, x. 38). He declares that the most real faith is that which *has not seen*. And could he be one who would

still that effect produced on the Jews is not of so little effect, since it becomes the cause of Palm Sunday. And how are we to believe that the whole picture described in chap. xi. could only be a fiction, created on account of those words of Luke! M. Renan, after much hesitation, ends by believing also in a borrowed connection between the poor Lazarus of the parable and the Lazarus of the Johannine narrative. Only he reverses the relation established by the school of Tübingen. According to him, it must have been the Lazarus of John who was set up as a model for that of Luke (p. 507). The resemblance is so striking! The two assertions are of equal value. See on that subject Luthardt, p. 156 ff., from whom have been partly borrowed the materials for this note.

[1] *Einl.* p. 719: "John's narrative supposes the three Synoptics."

meanly take pleasure in exaggerating the miraculous view of miracles already known! And why then omit in this case the two most stupendous facts in the life of the Lord Himself, the transfiguration and ascension?

Moreover, in what respect is the miracle of Cana more wonderful than the multiplication of the loaves, related by all the Synoptics? Is it not a simpler act to transform the qualities of matter, than to multiply the substance itself? Does not this second act approach much nearer to creation, even when it does not pass the boundary which separates the supernatural from the magical, since it is the matter provided by nature which remains in that instance also the basis of miraculous working? What does it signify that in the cure of the nobleman's son the distance between Capernaum and Cana is more considerable than that which separates Jesus from the centurion of Capernaum, in the well-known miracle narrated in Matt. viii. and parallel passages? The cure wrought by the will of Jesus does not change its nature by the increase of the distance. The impotent man of Bethesda was ill for thirty-eight years: but how are we to establish a comparison with the paralytic healed in the Synoptics, since no chronological indication is found in their narrative? The cure of a man born blind is doubtless a greater wonder than that of an ordinary blind person. But if that miracle took place at Jerusalem, its omission in the Synoptics, which do not relate sojourns in that capital, would give no ground for astonishment. Lazarus had been dead four days, whilst the widow of Nain's son had been so probably for some hours, and the daughter of Jairus for some minutes only. But if the author had invented a prodigy of that kind to exalt the glory of the Logos, would he not have depicted, as with a touch borrowed from the Old Testament, the bones of some ancient prophet reduced to dust, and returning to life at the command of Jesus? In this way the alleged theme of the narrative would have been better illustrated, "I am the resurrection and the life."

But it is not with this so-called excessive character of the miracles of the fourth Gospel that criticism is displeased, it is with the miracles *in themselves;* for we know that those in the Synoptics are not admitted any more than others, at least

those which cannot be explained by the action of an "exquisite personality on diseased nerves."[1] We shall be on our guard here against a general discussion of the question of the metaphysical possibility of miracles. We shall only say that to deny the historical character of a statement for the *à priori* reason that it contains miraculous elements, is no longer to criticise; it is to philosophize or to dogmatize. Such a method is the antipodes of the pretension to establish history on the basis of authenticated facts, that is to say, of true historical criticism. As to that negation of the supernatural in itself, we understand it in a savant who makes profession of materialism or of pantheism. But on the part of theistic writers, who profess belief in the personality and liberty of God, that *à priori* negation is a flagrant inconsistency. If God has created man free in order to raise him to Himself by the filial bond, and to cause him one day to become the organ of His thought and of His power, why should He not accord to him what every father grants to his child—the privilege of a moral education? And who can say in what degree nature may enter as a factor into the work of that education? The question is not one of correcting and completing it after it is done, but of correcting and perfecting man by its co-operation, when the employment of such means becomes necessary. As the organ accompanies the voice which sings the words of the hymn, so the grand voices of nature, alternately gentle or terrible, unite with the voice of the Holy Spirit, which reveals to man the thoughts of divine love. Now it may happen at certain moments that, in order to swell the regular accompaniment of nature, the Divine Artist presses the pedal and augments the note; there is the miracle. If every artist knows the secret springs of his instrument, by which he can at certain moments produce the most striking effects, should not God have also reserved to Himself certain openings in His admirable instrument, by means of which He may draw from it new effects, and interpose more efficiently in the education of His privileged creatures?

Finally, in these latter times a serious imputation has been raised against the character of the fourth evangelist, which, if it were well founded, might react on the apprecia-

[1] M. Renan.

tion of his work. To him has been attributed, on the one hand, an implacable hatred against Judas, whom he takes pleasure in traducing; and, on the other, a feeling of jealous rivalry in reference to Peter, to whom tradition had assigned the first part, whilst it had left John in the shade. In regard to the first, M. Renan is not afraid to say: "We shall mark the singular hatred of our author against Judas of Kerioth." "Certainly," he adds, "the Synoptics have no tenderness for the latter; but the hatred in the fourth narrator is more deliberate, more personal" (p. 499). To suppose that our evangelist was really influenced by such a sentiment, could only lead to the conclusion that an alteration of the evangelical history in general had taken place under his pen. In return, we do not know any fact which would be more fitted to prove the *apostolic* composition of our Gospel. A personal hatred supposes a personal relation. How is it possible to admit that a writer of the second century could have been haunted by a feeling of personal enmity towards Judas? Exegesis, however, will give, we trust, a satisfactory account of all the declarations of our Gospel respecting the traitor.

In regard to the second point, M. Renan has given expression to the idea that John himself, the author of the tradition comprised in our Gospel, must have been wounded by the preponderant part accorded to Peter in the Synoptics. Weizsäcker supposes that it was a subsequent editor, a disciple of John, who laboured to bring his master forth from the comparative obscurity in which tradition had left him. Baur, finally, here sees quite a refinement of ecclesiastical tactics; the author would seek to disparage, in the person of Peter, the whole of Judæo-Christianity, and to exalt Paulinism, by personifying it in the disciple whom Jesus loved. In every instance, it is said, where Peter is presented under a favourable light, there immediately occurs some act which depreciates him, and in return exalts the disciple whom Jesus loved. Thus in chap. i. Peter is undoubtedly one of the first called, but he only comes third; and the first and second rank are given to Andrew and to John. But how does it happen that, if the author wished in some way to disparage Peter, he introduced Andrew by describing him as the *brother of Simon Peter* (i. 41), —of that Simon who was not yet named, and who is thus

brought forward, at the first mention, as the principal individual in the train of Jesus? The same form is reproduced in vi. 8. Then how does it happen that Simon, and Simon alone, was immediately honoured with a glorious surname? In short, if one of the two first has the honour of having brought Peter to Jesus, it is not John, it is Andrew his brother! Where, then, are the proofs of that alleged rivalry of Peter and John in that portion of the history? It is alleged also that at the last supper Peter refuses to allow his feet to be washed. But is there disgrace in that? Does not that trait rather do honour to Peter, especially if we add his admirable reply to Jesus when the latter reproved him for his well-intended resistance? It is further alleged that Peter had recourse to the intervention of the disciple whom Jesus loved to discover the name of the traitor, a circumstance which assigns to him a position inferior to that disciple. But what if that circumstance arose simply from the place which the two disciples occupied at table during the last supper? In chap. xviii. Peter is introduced into the high priest's house by another disciple; but the narrative by no means says that that other disciple was he whom Jesus loved; and with the anti-Jewish tendency which is attributed to the whole narrative, an intimate connection with the high priest would appear rather a disgrace than an honour. In the same chapter Peter is described as he who drew his sword and wounded a servant of the high priest (the latter is also named for the first time). But does not that act do honour to the courageous devotion of Peter? And even if we wished merely to see in it a proof of his imprudent presumption, how can we imagine that such was an invention, and consequently a gratuitous calumny, by the author against the chief of the apostles? Yes, so it is said; and that with the aim of discrediting Judæo-Christianity, which was personified in Peter. What hateful Machiavelism! What an abuse of the personal name of the apostle for the purposes of ecclesiastical politics! What disgraceful tactics!

The narrative of Peter's denial is related in the fourth Gospel in a very attenuated manner, compared with the Synoptics, and especially with Matthew. In the latter, Peter twice denies with an oath, and anathematizes himself (Matt. xxvi. 72–74). John contents himself with the expression,

"*he said.*" And that is the narrative which is accused of disparaging intentions!

On the morning of the resurrection the disciple whom Jesus loved ran faster than Peter; and Peter, more daring, enters first into the sepulchre. But what is there in that calculated to depreciate Peter, unless swiftness of limbs is a virtue superior to courage of heart? And is it by such means that our author could have hoped to procure the triumph of Paulinism over Judæo-Christianity? What puerility! How, after having ascribed such nonsense to the evangelist, could his work be called, as Hilgenfeld has done, the gospel of the eagle flight?

In chap. xxi. Peter receives the direction of the church and of the whole Christian work. "Feed my lambs; guide my sheep," said Jesus to him; and as a means of glorifying God and entirely effacing his denial, He promises him the honour of a bloody martyrdom. And all that was invented with the aim of depreciating Peter and the Church of Rome, personified in him! But, it is said, that promise is eclipsed by the one, much greater, which is immediately given to the disciple whom Jesus loved—the promise that he should not see death. We can easily recognise there, says Hilgenfeld, the rivalry between the two chief apostles. Is it possible thus to pervert the meaning of such a narrative? And do we not see that such an alleged denial of the future death of John is in its turn denied by the narrative itself, and that the author has really no other intention than to correct the exaggerated value which had been attached to those words. Yet "Jesus had not said, He shall not die; but, If I will that he tarry till I come." And in each case does not the expression employed in reference to Peter: "the death by which he *should glorify God*," give to that apostle the superiority of honour?

There is, moreover, one fact which is sufficient to characterize the position which the evangelist proposes to give to Peter. That is the magnificent profession of faith which he puts in his mouth in the name of all the apostles at the end of chap. vi.: "Lord, to whom shall we go? We believe and are sure that Thou art the Holy One of God." At that solemn moment of crisis and decision, the culminating point of the Galilean ministry, there is assigned to Peter the striking and

incomparable part; and yet it is maintained that one of the aims of our Gospel is to bring him down to the second rank! Baur, in imputing to the author, in reference to the twenty-first chapter, the intention of depreciating Rome and its Apostle Peter, in order to exalt John and Asia Minor, forgets that, according to his opinion, the author had changed the day of the death of Jesus to make Rome and its bishop to triumph over the churches of Asia and their Johannine tradition! Or else, to escape that contradiction, will they try to attribute to the skilful writer a system of see-saw, in virtue of which he would sometimes favour the one, sometimes the other of the two rival parties? To what a complication of contradictory motives and truly ignoble manœuvres do we thus come! And that for the purpose of explaining a writing which, in point of form, is more divinely simple, and in substance more sacredly clear, than any other in the world!

B. *The Discourses.*

It has been attempted to attribute the facts related in the fourth Gospel to the free conception of its author; with much more reason might it be expected that by the same method there should be explained the composition of the discourses which form so considerable a portion of that narrative. Several critics, who maintain its historical fidelity in respect of the first of these two elements of the narrative, more or less completely abandon the defence in regard to the second. According to M. Reuss, these discourses are the work of the writer, although it is not necessary, for all that, to think that, "in reference to their most important contents, they are invented."[1] M. Renan goes farther: "These are pieces of theology and rhetoric having no analogy with the discourses of Jesus in the Synoptics, and to which must not be attributed any more historical reality than to the discourses which Plato puts into the mouth of his master at the moment of death."[2] Nearly the same estimate is found in all the critics of the same school. The following are the main considerations by which it is supported. Let us class them under three heads

1st. The external and internal *improbabilities.*

[1] *Gesch. d. h. Schr. N. T.*, pp. 219 and 220. [2] P. 520.

2d. The striking *contrasts* which they present to the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels.

3d. The not less surprising *conformity* of ideas and of style with the discourses of John the Baptist in our Gospel, with the Prologue, and with the First Epistle.

Before entering on the examination of these difficulties, we must explain the limits within which we believe it possible to resolve them, and to defend the historical truth of the fourth Gospel from the point of view of the discourses of Jesus. It is, above all, necessary to remember that Jesus spoke in the Aramaic language, and that it is in Greek that we possess His discourses in our Gospel. However flexible the Hellenic tongue may be, the difference between it and that in which Jesus spoke is so profound, that if the report of such discourses were not to be intolerable to Greek ears, a considerable elaboration was necessary to adapt them to that new audience.

In the second place, those discourses are far from being given *in extenso*. The conversation with Nicodemus, for instance, the account of which scarcely takes five minutes to read, certainly lasted several hours. We must then admit a process of condensation, similar to that which a sermon of an hour's length by Ad. Monod would undergo when reproduced in two pages by one of his hearers. This second fact imposes on us the necessity of admitting a still more thorough elaboration.

Finally, as it is improbable that the memory of the author may have been refreshed by notes taken on the spot (although we cannot absolutely deny the possibility of such procedure), and as it is in any case only at an advanced period of the apostolic age, and after the publication of the Synoptics, that this Gospel was composed, we must further admit a third form of elaboration; and this is the work of memory, which incessantly goes back and reproduces from within what it has preserved, and thereby fixes for itself its contents with increasing definiteness.

The discourses of the fourth Gospel, then, do not resemble a photograph, but the extracted essence of a savoury fruit. From the change wrought in the external form of the substance, it does not follow that the slightest foreign element has been mingled with the latter.

It is from this point of view, and from this point of view only, that we propose to defend the historical truth of the discourses of Jesus in our Gospel. M. H. Meyer has well stated it in these terms: "We find in the fourth Gospel the discourses of Jesus Himself, reproduced *faithfully*, though *not literally*." Let us now consider the objections which have been raised against this way of regarding it.

1. We begin with those which are derived from certain *improbabilities*, whether external or internal, in the conversations and discourses. A certain *uniformity* in the progress of the conversations has been made a ground of objection,—the author makes his hearers guilty of a gross misunderstanding; Jesus then, going beyond His preceding declaration, urges the contradiction to an extreme. But this uniformity of method may very well belong to the history itself; for it arose from a circumstance which was constantly occurring. Every time that Jesus came into contact with the multitude who surrounded Him, why should not a shock have taken place between His altogether spiritual ideas and the carnal feelings of His interrogators? Would He have aroused the world had He not possessed in reference to it an absolute superiority? When a cloud charged with positive electricity comes across a group of clouds negatively electrified, will there not take place a phenomenon of neutralization frequently repeated, under the form, always like itself, of lightning flashes and thunder peals?

But, it is asserted, the want of intelligence in His hearers is in every instance exaggerated; it reaches to stupidity. The instance which is quoted with the greatest readiness is the reply of Nicodemus, iii. 4: "How can a man be born when he is old?" etc. But, supposing this to be really a serious misunderstanding on his part, and not a *reductio ad absurdum*, would such a want of intelligence be more inadmissible than that of the disciples, who, in the Synoptics, on hearing the warning of Jesus: "Take heed, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees," imagine that this was an indirect way of reproaching them for their forgetfulness in neglecting to provide themselves with bread for the journey? (Matt. xvi. 6, 7; Mark viii. 15–18.) It was thus that the disciples understood Jesus, after having been His companions for a

whole year! And the misapprehension of Nicodemus, or of any other Jew who met Him for the first time, is deemed to be impossible! Let us picture to ourselves one of our most ignorant peasants opening one of the Gospels for the first time. He already possesses a vague knowledge of Christianity; and yet what a want of intelligence would he not exhibit as soon as he was questioned on the subject?[1]

Again, the discourses which the evangelist puts into the mouth of Jesus are censured for want of appropriateness, for the absence of sufficient points of support in certain given situations. But does not the conversation with Nicodemus, *the Pharisee*, oppose, point for point, the divine truth to all the articles of the false Messianic programme current in the school to which that individual belonged?—the spiritual nature of the kingdom of God to its appearance in an external and magical manner? the true condition of participation in that state of things to vain observances and legal works? the true Messiah, who comes down from God, and consents to die in order to save the world, to the expectation of the new Solomon who is to glorify Israel in loading it with terrestrial gifts? the just judgment of God, who draws the line of demarcation betwixt the friends of light and the friends of darkness, to the partial judgment which saves the Jews only, and causes the heathen to perish? Do we find, in regarding it from this point of view, in all that conversation one word which is inappropriate, and which does not correspond to the given situation? In chap. iv. do we not in some way perceive, stretching across the conversation with the Samaritan woman, the well of Jacob with the patriarch Joseph's tomb in the distance; then the top of Gerizim with its place of worship, a rival to that of Jerusalem; finally, the nascent verdure of the corn-fields in the great valley of Mokna, which displays itself before the eyes of the questioners? Is not the fact of the cure of the impotent man all throughout the theme of the magnificent tableau of the quickening activity of Christ, sketched in the first part of the discourse in chap. v., and the point of support to all the

[1] A pious Christian woman on reading those words: "The days shall be shortened," applied them seriously to the contraction of the days in autumn, and could not understand what agreement there could be between that fact and the perseverance of the elect!

second portion of that same discourse, relating to the testimony which the Father gives to Jesus? Does not the whole of the grand discourse of chap. vi. rest on the fact of the multiplication of the loaves, which had just been accomplished, and which Jesus makes the symbol of the communication of the divine life in His person to mankind? The grand theocratic recollections recalled by the feast of Tabernacles (the water from the rock, the pillar of fire in the desert) serve equally as the starting-point and subject of all the discourses or considerations of chap. vii. and viii. The discourse of chap. x. on the good shepherd, who calls his sheep out of the theocratic fold, and who groups around them those of the whole world, connect themselves directly with the fact of the expulsion of the man who was born blind by the Sanhedrim, and with the welcome which he received from Jesus. The request of the Greeks in chap. xii. calls forth the incomparable discourse, in which Jesus reminds us that the grain of corn must die to bring forth the ear hoped for by the husbandman. Finally, the last discourses, chap. xiii. to xvii., rest entirely upon the two actual facts of the treachery of Judas, and the impending separation of Jesus from His disciples. Often, it is said, the narrative does not conclude; and it is not known what was the issue of the conversation. Thus, iii. 21: "We, indeed, see Nicodemus coming," says M. Reuss, "but we do not see him going away." We do not learn either whether the Greeks were admitted to a private interview with Jesus (xii. 33). The whole is so much a matter of imagination, and not of history, that it is often impossible to distinguish the point where the words of Jesus or of John the Baptist end, and where the reflections of the evangelist begin (iii. 16, 17, 30, 31). As if the readers required to be told that Nicodemus returned home after talking with our Lord! As if it were of any importance to the church to know whether those Greeks were admitted or not into His presence! The true close of these narratives is Nicodemus taking part in the burial of Jesus (chap. xix.), and the Greek world open henceforth to the faith, and receiving from the hands of the author that very Gospel. In regard to the reflections which the evangelist is said to have added to certain discourses by Jesus or the forerunner, we cannot discern the point where they

begin, because they do not begin at all. That idea is a fiction which vanishes before an attentive exegesis. We have already established it in reference to the latter portion of the conversation with Nicodemus. The last words especially (iii. 21): "He that doeth truth cometh to the light," bear the seal of the most delicate appropriateness. They contain a precise allusion to the actual procedure of the old Pharisee, an encouraging testimony rendered to his love of truth, and an adieu which is a true *au revoir*. We shall in like manner see farther on that the discourse of John the Baptist, iii. 27–36, strictly studied, forms an indivisible whole, and that down to the last word it is appropriate to no one else than the forerunner.

Neither do we recognise, it is said, in that manner of teaching adopted by Jesus, so mystical, so paradoxical, so unintelligible to His auditors, His merciful condescension, His pedagogic wisdom.—There is here, indeed, a weighty problem, a problem which experience alone can solve. We see geniuses proceeding by two contrary methods to elevate their age to themselves. Sometimes they throw a bridge,—sometimes, on the contrary, they seem to take pleasure in digging an abyss, between their contemporaries and themselves. The aim of the two opposite methods is the same. The second is to arouse torpid spirits by a violent shock, and to irresistibly excite their attention; the first serves to initiate minds, once awakened, in the new point of view. Why should not Jesus have employed them both? He could do so, all the more that, even in coming into collision with minds by the use of the first, His words were marked with the stamp of a superior holiness, which commended them at once to every upright heart.

It is alleged also, that sometimes previous words of Jesus are recalled by Him to hearers who had not heard them. In support of this reproach, we may cite only one example, that of x. 26, where Jesus recalls, being then at the feast of Dedication, the words which He had uttered three months before at the feast of Tabernacles. But on those two occasions did He not speak in the same town and in the same temple? And if one portion of His hearers, the foreign pilgrims who had come to the feast of Tabernacles, had left the capital, would not the inhabitants of Jerusalem constitute that per-

manent portion of the audience to whom He might recall some of His preceding declarations? If He reminds His disciples, in xiii. 33, in applying to them words formerly addressed to the Jews (vii. 34), it is to make them at the same time observe the difference of meaning and of application.

Such are the formal improbabilities.[1] Let us pass on to those which bear on the substance itself of the conversations and discourses.

The *internal progress* of the discourses is, first of all, found fault with. They are deficient in dialectic progress. And, indeed, if the point in question had reference to a mode of argumentation, such as we meet with in St. Paul, there is a deficiency. But alongside the style of argumentation of minds that are essentially logical, there is that of intuitive minds. The latter no longer consists of a chain of propositions which is unfolded. The understanding observes and simply declares what it sees; and that, at first, in a summary expression which virtually embraces all the contents of the idea or of the fact contemplated. To that first glance there immediately succeeds a second, more penetrating. The most essential elements of the fact or of the idea become visible to the eyes of the mind which discerns them, and which now expounds them in their succession and diversity. That is not all; each of these elements becomes in its turn the object of a new intuition, and of that analysis of look which penetrates to the most concrete details and most special applications of the truth contemplated. This method, which I would style *concentric*, because it begins by laying down a summary proposition, the idea of which is afterwards reproduced in a series of circles formed round that centre, makes use of affirmation or negation, not of argumentation. Such is not that of the Greek mind, which loves above everything all the links of the Syllogism. It is that of the Semitic spirit, which, as M.

[1] In order that our readers may form some idea of the shamelessness at which a certain criticism has arrived, we shall here quote the following lines from M. Stap (*Historical and Critical Studies*, p. 325): "The personages whom the author brings on the stage, always the same under different names, act and speak contrary to all known rules; they go, come, substitute themselves for each other without our knowing why, or how or what becomes of them." There is really nothing for it but to send the evangelist—or his critic?—to Bedlam.

Renan says, "proceeds by intuition, not by deduction." Such must be that of Jesus, the Semite *par excellence*. He ascribes it to Himself: "We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen," said He to Nicodemus. There is nothing more living, more real, than such a form. It is that which allows us to follow with the greatest facility the immediate production of the thought in the mind of him who converses with us. And very far from finding in that a ground of suspicion against the authenticity of the discourses, have we not a right to quote it as a proof in its favour? Those discourses in which it appears in the most marked manner are the two of chap. v. and vi. In chap. v. the idea of the collaboration of the Son with His Father, in virtue of the entire dependence of the former, is first summarily expressed in ver. 17. It afterwards unfolds itself in a first circle, vv. 19 and 29, where its two chief aspects appear: in ver. 19, the Son observing the Father; in ver. 20, the Father showing all His work to the Son. Then, in a second circle, that work of the Father divides itself into two principal works, in which is summed up all the divine activity which the Father exercises by the Son: quickening, in ver. 21; and judging, in ver. 22; with the consequence of that relation, the divine homage which ought to be rendered to the Son as well as to the Father, in ver. 23. Finally, in a third circle, vv. 24–29, these two divine works are successively taken up and followed through their spiritual phases down to their most external and concrete result: the resurrection, vv. 24–26; the judgment, vv. 27–29. The discourse in chap. vi. presents a perfectly similar instance (see the exegesis). Doubtless, even in John, Jesus does not always speak thus; for He is not only the perfect Semite, but likewise the complete man. In chap. iv., vii., viii., xvii., His words do not proceed so visibly in accordance with that law. That arises from the very nature of the subjects treated of. But we do not see what psychological improbability would be contained in the principal method described above. It includes rather, as we have seen, in its very nature, a striking indication of historic truth. It offers us, again, a similar guarantee from another point of view. It has sometimes been alleged against the truth of these long discourses, that it must have been impossible for

the author to have retained them in his memory.[1] That difficulty is much diminished when we take into account the form of exposition which we have just pointed out. The central thought serves as a point of support to the memory, which, setting out from that, very speedily recovers the secondary ideas, and so on down to the details. In those instances where the words of Jesus have not that character, they generally assume the form of a dialogue, and the support to the memory is then to be found in the interruptions of the interlocutors. Comp., for instance, chap. vii. and xiv.

Weizsäcker has raised another objection. According to him, it is the ideas of the prologue, consequently those of the author, which reappear throughout the whole Gospel under the form of discourses. But what if the relation were an inverse one,—if, in fact, the prologue were only a summary of the essential thoughts which the evangelist had eliminated from the discourses themselves of his Master? He would then have placed that summary at the outset of his book to let the reader see his position, and from the very commencement to cast a ray of light over the domain which he was about to traverse along with him. Of these two explanations, which is the true one? One fact appears to me to speak strongly in favour of the second, and against that which Weizsäcker adopts. That is, the absence in the discourses of Jesus of the term Logos in the sense in which it is employed at the beginning of the prologue. If the prologue were a topic which was enlarged on by the evangelist farther on, that term could not fail to reappear afterwards in his discourses. A third objection, relating to the substance of the discourses, has been stated in a very lively manner by M. Renan. He discovers in those compositions "nothing but an obscure Gnosis and distorted metaphysics." Now, "it was not by affected, heavy, ill-written tirades, expressing little to the moral sense, that Jesus established His divine work" (pp. lxix. and lxx.). The case may well appear such to him who sees in these discourses only the more or less uniform exposition of the theory of the Logos, and of the author's speculations on that philosophical subject; but for the believer, who discerns in them the testimony of Christ concerning the love wherewith God,

[1] M. Reuss gives up that objection (sec. 219).

the indefinite and mysterious Being to whom we owe our existence, has loved us in giving us Him in whom are eternally realized all His divine thoughts, all His divine affections, and all His divine will,—for such a reader each of these testimonies assumes an infinite value; in meditating on them, he sees each time a new opening, as it were, formed in the luminous depths of the divine life imparted in Jesus to mankind; his heart finds in them incomparable nourishment, and does not experience in enjoying them word by word any feeling of monotony or tediousness. The following is what even Keim himself cannot help saying (p. 207): "In this book we meet with profound words of Jesus, with a language adorned with the richest images: by the side of that a masterly dialectic precision, and testimonies of Jesus, at one time tender, at another spiritual, at another lofty, sublime." Moreover, I cannot think that criticism would have assailed with such violence the historical truth of those discourses, if it had not had more powerful reasons to plead than the preceding. We pass on to what seems decisive to many persons: the *contrast* between the discourses of Jesus in our Gospel, and His teachings in the Synoptics.

2. With regard to this, two kinds of differences are pointed out, the one bearing on the very substance of the teaching, the others on the manner of exposition. In reference to the contents of the teaching, there are three points especially which are in question: the part which Jesus bears towards us, His divine and personal pre-existence, and His eschatological intuitions.

In the Synoptics, the *rôle* of Jesus is subordinated to the most general idea of the kingdom of God. Salvation consists in entering into that kingdom; in order to do so, it is necessary to practise the *righteousness of the kingdom;* and the teaching of Jesus is substantially occupied with the duties which constitute that righteousness. The person of Jesus has, it is maintained, merely a subordinate part in that whole, that of being the head of that state of things. In John, on the contrary, salvation consists in the attaching of faith to the person of Jesus; to incorporate with oneself Jesus, in whom God reveals and gives Himself, is the real possession of the kingdom. In the former, then, the king is confused with the king-

dom, which is independent of His person; in the latter, the kingdom is entirely personified in the king. Such is the contrast as established by criticism.

Such a contrast would really exist as an insoluble contradiction, if, in John, when once the believer is in possession of Jesus, there was nothing further for him to look forward to, or if, in the Synoptics, the entrance to the kingdom was granted on any other condition than the attaching of faith to the person of Jesus. But the one supposition is not better founded than the other. The idea of the external kingdom which is to crown the spiritual life, which the believer enjoys here below, is by no means denied by John; it is affirmed in xiv. 1–3, where Jesus promises to the disciples to come and take them when they shall have completed their task, in order to introduce them into His Father's house, where they shall behold His eternal glory (xvii. 24). For that purpose He will raise them bodily by a resurrection of life (v. 29), which will consummate the spiritual life which He had communicated to them here below (vi. 39, 40, 44). That is the kingdom which appears in John as the term of the spiritual life. And, on the other hand, the person of Jesus is, in the Synoptics, inseparable from the idea of the kingdom of which He is the head; it is the central fact of the new state of things. Everything has reference to Jesus in the life of the believer. It is that connection with Him which gives an infinite value to the least of his actions. To receive *one of these little ones* with a friendly smile, is to receive Jesus; and to receive Jesus, is to receive God Himself (Mark ix. 37). To do anything for one of these little ones, is to secure Jesus as a debtor on the judgment day (Matt. xxv. 3 ff.). For Jesus is to such a degree the living Good, that everything which men do for the good, they do for Him personally. The most sacred relations of human life are subordinated to that which unites the believer to Jesus to such a degree, that he ought to be always ready to sacrifice them to the latter (Matt. x. 37). Not to be found worthy of Jesus, is equivalent to being rejected by Him (ver. 38); and the condition of one day finding one's life, is to have given it *for His sake*. "Depart from *me*," is from the lips of Jesus as it would be from the mouth of God Himself, the formula of eternal malediction (Matt. xxv. 41). To say: "*I* never knew

you," is to say: "*God* does not know you" (Matt. vii. 23). We see it; what God in the Old Covenant reserved for Himself alone, and of which He said: "My glory will I not give to another," the central dignity in reference to the human soul, Jesus without hesitation ascribes to Himself. The rite of the Holy Supper, which makes all religious and moral life depend on personal union with Jesus, would, moreover, suffice to render visible the fact which we are here establishing; and it is because in the Synoptics, as in John, the idea of the kingdom concentrates itself in that of the personal possession of the King Himself.

The contrast is then in reality only relative. In the Synoptics, the practical obligations which result from that personal relation to Jesus, and which constitute the character of the believer, are developed more in detail; whilst in John the central idea, that of the very relation with Christ, is alone brought forward. And if it is so, it is purely because the author of the fourth Gospel knows very well that it is useless to repeat for the sake of the church all those precepts regarding Providence, the employment of worldly goods, humility, benevolence, watching, prayer, which, when he wrote his narrative, were already current in the church, either orally or in writings which were generally known.

There is one point, however, on which the teaching of Jesus in John's Gospel seems decidedly to go beyond that of the Synoptic Gospels. It is the idea of the *divine pre-existence* of Jesus. Must we recognise here an element of personal or foreign speculation, — an importation by the author, which would establish a real difference between the teaching of Jesus in his writings and that which is contained in the Synoptics?

What we have just said of the *central position* which Jesus takes in the latter towards every human soul,—a position which, in the Old Testament, is that of God Himself,—implicitly contains the answer to that question. The Jewish Monotheism allows absolute confidence and supreme love to be given to God alone; and Jesus claims them for Himself in the name of our eternal salvation! In Him, then, unless He intended to disown Moses, must be found the consciousness of a divine foundation as the principle of His being. Such a presumption, derived from the position assumed by

Jesus in the Synoptics, is confirmed by a multitude of words which we expressly read in them. In Luke i. 17 the angel says to Zacharias that John "will turn many of the children of Israel to the *Lord their God.*" He then adds, "he shall go *before Him* in the spirit and power of Elias." Before whom? Evidently before Him whom he had just called the Lord their God. Now the latter, according to the context, is none other than the Messiah, for whom John should prepare the way. Jesus Christ, Matt. xxi., in the parable of the vine-dressers, distinguishes Himself from the servants (the prophets), in ascribing to Himself exclusively the rank of Son. In Mark xiii. 32 is found the following gradation: "But of that day knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." Let the meaning of the question of Jesus in Matt. xxii. 45 and parallel passages be wrested as much as you please: "If David, then, call Christ *his Lord,* how is he *his son?*" the good sense of simple readers will always do justice on the subtleties of theologians, and will only answer that question by distinguishing two relations—the one by which Jesus is the Lord of David (that on which rests His divine origin), the other in virtue of which He descends from David (His human relation of sonship). Finally, the observation is certainly not unduly made, when Julius Müller remarks regarding the formula of the institution of baptism, Matt. xxviii. 19: "In the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," that if the mention of the Holy Ghost after the Father and the Son guarantees the personality of the Spirit, the mention of the Son between the Father and the Holy Ghost guarantees the divinity of the Son.

Now, if the divine character of Jesus is positively recognised in the Synoptics, His pre-existence necessarily results from it, even if it is not expressly taught. Weizsäcker (p. 221) remarks, that the teaching of St. Paul on the heavenly origin of Jesus, on His *rôle* as the organ of the Father in the work of the creation of the world, as well as in that of the redemption of mankind, has never met with the slightest contradiction, even at the time when apostolic tradition was still living. And from that fact he rightly concludes that the conception of the person of Jesus expounded by Paul was not

his peculiar doctrine, but that it must have belonged to the type of teaching of the primitive church. Now, how could that be possible, if certain words of Jesus had not supported and even called forth a similar method of view, which the most elementary religious principles of Judaism appeared to condemn?

Those words of Jesus, which we have been thus led to postulate, we meet again precisely in the fourth Gospel. They are especially those three: vi. 62: "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up *where He was before?*" viii. 58: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, *I am*;" xvii. 5: "And now, O Father, glorify Thou me with Thine own self, with the glory which I had with Thee *before the world was.*" (Compare again ver. 24: "For Thou lovedst me *before the foundation of the world.*") Is there any impossibility in this, that these few witnesses, in which is expressed the consciousness that Christ bore within Him of His peculiar relation to God, prior even to His earthly existence,—that these witnesses, we say, may have been neglected at the moment of the formation of the oral tradition on which our Synoptics depend? One fact is sufficient to settle that question. When Luke, by means of the special information which he had collected after much inquiry, strove to complete the accounts of the teaching of Jesus, what an enormous mass of materials did he not discover which had been omitted down to his time, and which are wanting even in Matthew and Mark! Thus, what may more particularly astonish us, viz. several of His finest and most original parables: the lost sheep, the missing piece of money, the prodigal son, the faithless steward, the wicked rich man, the Pharisee and the tax-gatherer, the unjust judge, the good Samaritan; all so many treasures which Luke has restored to the church. And yet the popular and deeply impressive character of those pictures—as, for instance, that of the prodigal son—seems as if it ought to have preserved them from such oblivion, and to have secured them from the outset the place of honour in the oral preaching of the gospel! And, in face of that fact, should we refuse to admit that three or four words of a very lofty character, profoundly mysterious, like those we have just quoted, might have disappeared for a moment from tradition, in order to reappear a little later as really historical reminiscences of a

witness who probably paid special attention to that which, in the teaching of Jesus, directly concerned His person.

It is important also to take into account the special aim which the author of the fourth Gospel had in view. He has stated it himself in an explicit manner in chap. xx. 31: "But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the *Christ, the* Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through His name." He wishes, then, to relate those acts and testimonies of Jesus which brought himself to believe in His Messianic dignity and in His divine nature, in order that his readers, associated with that faith, on the basis of the same facts and the same testimonies, may likewise participate in the life which he has found in it. That is, in like manner, the idea developed at the beginning of the first Epistle (i. 1-3). Agreeably to that design, he accordingly proposed to reproduce, not the teaching of Jesus on all subjects whatever, but exclusively such of His declarations as referred to His person, and had produced in him, the author, the conviction, first of His Messianic, then of His divine character. And that is the reason that he recalls those striking declarations of Jesus which had laid the foundation of his faith, as well as that of his colleagues, on this particular point. It is in this way that he was led to complete, in that respect as in many others, the narrative of the Synoptics, which comprised scarcely anything save what had been more or less accidentally admitted at the first moment into the cycle of missionary teaching.

Finally, these two teachings are opposed from the point of view of *eschatological ideas.*

The Synoptics make Jesus utter discourses, according to which He is to return personally and visibly at the close of time, to establish the reign of God. According to John, on the contrary, Jesus had promised to return only in a spiritual sense, under the form of the Holy Ghost, who will cause Him to be born again, and to live in the hearts of His own. But here also we can discover in the texts only a purely relative contrast, and of such a kind that one of the two teachings, very far from excluding the other, demands and completes it. Let us first of all observe, that those who raise this objection do not any more believe in the historical character of the discourses of Jesus contained in the Synoptics, which relate

to His future return, than in that of the teachings of John. These are, in their eyes, day-dreams, which a Jewish-Christian poet has taken the liberty of putting into the mouth of Jesus, and which (a thing incredible) found immediate entrance into the church, and even into our Synoptic writings. But in that case, we ask how those who profess that opinion respecting the eschatological discourses in the Synoptics can deny the historical truth of the Johannine discourses, "for they are in opposition to the eschatological discourses of the Synoptics," discourses which have never been uttered by Jesus! As for ourselves, we cannot recognise that alleged contradiction. On the one hand, the promises of Jesus contained in John by no means exclude in the mind of that evangelist His visible return at the close of time, to consummate His work by the judgment and by the resurrection of the body. We have given above the proof of this, derived from the Gospel itself (p. 144). On the other side, we demonstrate no less easily that the Synoptics do not in any way mistake the necessity of the work of the Holy Spirit amongst men, as the preparation for the Parousia. The kingdom of God is essentially *within the heart*, according to Luke (xvii. 20 and 21). A long period will elapse, during which the reign of God will exist here below only under that purely internal form (vv. 22 and 23). Jesus is spiritually present everywhere, where two or three are gathered in His name (Matt. xviii. 20). That invisible presence will remain with them "even unto the end of the world" (Matt. xxviii. 20). During all that time it will be the Holy Ghost who will support the witnesses of Jesus, and who will uphold the church (Luke xxiv. 46–49, xii. 11, 12; Acts i. 7, 8).

If John reports with great care the last discourses of Jesus in which these thoughts were developed, and omits the grand discourse on the final advent of our Lord (Matt. xxiv.), it is not that he in the slightest degree rejects that fact and opposes one of the two conceptions to the other; it is exactly as he relates the examination before Annas and omits the appearance before the Sanhedrim, or as he narrates the feet-washing and omits the institution of the Holy Supper. He is writing a new book, not to give a useless repetition of what every one has already read and re-read elsewhere, but taking

care to fill up the various blanks which strike him in the received tradition. An unanswerable proof of the truth of such a solution is supplied by the first Epistle, which every one at the present day is agreed anew to ascribe to the author of the Gospel, and where we read these words: "Abide in Him, that *when He shall appear*, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before Him *at His coming*" (ii. 28). We know that, *when He shall appear*, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is (iii. 2).[1]

We pass on to the objections which bear on the *form* of the discourses.

It is, first of all, a ground of objection that the discourses of the fourth Gospel frequently assume the form of a dialogue, which is almost quite foreign to those contained in the Synoptics. But if it were wished to give a proof of the truly historic character of the former, could a more striking one be found than that very form which is found fault with? These questions, these objections, these interruptions by the hearers of Jesus, are they not taken from the life, and do they not betray the recollections of the witness? Was not Rabbinical teaching imparted precisely by means of questions and answers? Besides, this form is not constant in the fourth Gospel; it appears in chap. iii. 5; it is more developed in chap. vi.; it entirely predominates in chap. vii. and viii., where Jesus can no longer, in any way, utter a word without being interrupted; it is again met with, although in a lesser degree, in chap. x.; it is more strongly marked in chap. xiv., after which it altogether disappears till the end of chap. xvi., where we once more find some traces of it. There is not, then, in that a *mannerism* of the author; there is rather here the seal of historical truth.

"The gem of the parable is wanting in this Gospel," Keim tells us. The parable is only a developed image; now the characteristic of imagery is not certainly wanting in the discourses of the fourth Gospel; the spirit is compared to the wind, which bloweth whither it will; the unbeliever is like the evil-

[1] The opinion of Hilgenfeld, who admits a spiritualization of the evangelist's ideas between the composition of the Epistle and that of the Gospel, breaks down before the proofs which make the Epistle to be a work subsequent to the Gospel, and against its own improbability.

doer, who shuns the day and accomplishes his evil deeds during the night; John was the torch which burns away, and Israel took a childish pleasure in the bright lustre which he gave forth; the believer will become through the Spirit a rock from which springs forth living water; Jesus is the grain of wheat which must die to bring forth fruit. His Passion is a cup which His Father gives Him to drink. He is in God's house the Son who alone can pronounce the sentence of manumission upon the captives. The disciples will pass as suddenly from grief to joy as the woman who brings a child into the world; they are the branches which will not grow except on the vine, and of which the Father Himself is the husbandman, etc. etc. This language, which is altogether imagery, is sometimes developed into complete allegory; thus in the three pictures of chap. x., where Jesus describes the Messiah as the shepherd, who in the morning assembles and arranges His flock; then as the door through which the flock can pass from the sheep-fold to the pasture, and from the pasture to the fold; finally, as the good shepherd who is at the same time owner of the flock, in opposition to the hireling or paid guardian, who would not sacrifice his life for the sheep which do not belong to him. Certainly these developed pictures are not far removed from the parable properly so called; and if the evangelist has not given us any specimen of the latter kind, it is because the parables were the most popular, and consequently the best known portion, of the teachings of Jesus, and of which the Synoptics were full.

We come to the chief objection: the *lofty, mystical language* which the author of the fourth Gospel ascribes to Jesus, and which has nothing in common with the simple, lively popular turn of His words in the Synoptics. In particular, there are cited the terms *light* and *darkness* instead of those of *righteousness* and *sin*, which are to be constantly met with in the Synoptics; or else the abstract expression *life, eternal life*, instead of that of the *kingdom of God* or *of heaven*, which plays so important a part in the latter, whilst it is met with only once in John (iii. 3); likewise these terms, *the Father, the Son*, employed in an absolute manner. Hence the whole style exhibits that entirely different complexion, from which results the fatal dilemma thus stated: "A choice must be

made; if Jesus has spoken as Matthew represents, He cannot have spoken as John describes." "Now," adds M. Renan, "between these two authorities no critic has hesitated, nor will hesitate."

It would be truly curious that the first who should have pointed out that contrast should be the evangelist himself, against whose narrative it has been brought forward as a ground of objection. The author of the fourth Gospel puts these words into the mouth of Jesus (iii. 12): "If I have told you *earthly things*, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of *heavenly things?*" He then declares that He came down from heaven to bring this divine message to the world. The author of the fourth Gospel was then clearly aware of two ways of teaching adopted by Jesus: the one, the usual, in which He explained earthly things, evidently always in their relation to God and His kingdom; the other, which contrasted in many respects with the first, and which Jesus employed only exceptionally, in which He spoke directly, and as a witness, of God and of the things of God, always naturally in connection with the fate of mankind. The instructions of the first kind had a more simple, more practical, more varied character. They referred to the different situations of life; it was the exposition of the true moral relations of men to each other, and of men to God. Jesus had been trained to that method of teaching by the experiences of the first thirty years of His life. It was then that He had learned to know the vices and virtues of men, the details of social and domestic life,—all those circumstances of ordinary life which occupy so important a part in His teachings in the Synoptics, and of which He made use, in particular, to form the body of His parables. That kind was evidently the most popular, and the best suited to the weakness of His hearers. But in that way Jesus could not attain to the final aim which He sought, the full revelation of the divine mystery, of the plan of salvation. Since His baptism, Jesus had heaven constantly open before Him; the decree of salvation was disclosed to Him; He had, in particular, heard those words: "Thou art my well beloved Son;" He reposed on the Father's bosom, and He could descend and re-descend without ceasing into the depths of the Father's fathomless

love, of which He felt the vivifying power; and when He came, at certain exceptional moments, to speak of that divine relationship, and to give scope to that fulness of life with which it supplied Him, His language took a peculiar, solemn, mystical, one might even say a heavenly tone; for they were *heavenly things* which He then revealed. Now, such is precisely the character of His language in the fourth Gospel. Perhaps that difference between the old treasure which He amassed from His experiences of human life, and the new, out of which He was drawing since His baptism, is such as He describes in Matt. xiii. 52 under the common image of a treasury, where the householder goes to search for *things new and old* for the instruction of His children.

It will certainly be objected that this hypothesis of a twofold source and a twofold method of teaching has only a weak point of support in the words of Jesus which we have quoted above. But those words must have a meaning. Moreover, we are in possession of a fact which fully justifies the distinction which they disclose to us. Luke describes a peculiar moment, exceptional in the life of Jesus, that of the return of the seventy disciples (x. 17 ff.). When they had given an account to Jesus of the success of their mission, and of the divine results which their humble words had produced, Jesus, beholding as in a prophetic picture the effects still more sublime, of which these were only the prelude, and which His gospel was about to produce throughout the whole world by means of these weak instruments, was Himself moved; He experienced, the evangelist tells us, an internal perturbation. He felt Himself transported, as it were, into the bosom of His Father, who was directing the execution of that magnificent plan with such wisdom and love. And His language at that moment assumed precisely that solemn, lofty, mystical tone which surprises us in the discourses of the fourth Gospel: "I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes; even so, Father; for so it seemed good in Thy sight. All things are delivered to me of my Father; and no man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father; and who the Father is, but the Son, and He to whom the Son will reveal Him." Who would not suppose that He was

reading a passage in the fourth Gospel? The same absolute employment of these two terms: *the Father, the Son;* the same deep and mystical meaning of the word *know;* the same entirely unique relation between God and Jesus; the same mediation of the Son, in order to communicate to the world the divine treasures, which He alone receives directly from the Father's hand. The relation of Jesus to the Father, the relation of Jesus to the world,—all that the fourth Gospel says on those two points is implied in that text, which is likewise found in Matt. xi. 25 to 27, and which is shielded from any critical doubts. We thus prove from the Synoptics that there were in the life of our Lord moments of extraordinary elevation, in which the too great fulness of His heart really overflowed in a form analogous to that of the discourses contained in the Johannine Gospel. But it will be said: How does it happen that in the fourth Gospel we find Jesus *daily* speaking in that way, whilst in the Synoptics we find Him only once thus expressing Himself?[1] Every day? But we have seen that of His ministry of two years and a half, John at the most describes to us a score of days! Thence it follows that those days were, in his eyes, chosen, exceptional days. Much more, of those twenty to thirty days mentioned in his narrative, he reports to us only *five* discourses, rightly so called: that of chap. iii., the conversation with Nicodemus, the inauguration of His teaching concerning heavenly things; that of chap. v., called forth by His first great work of power at Jerusalem; that of chap. vi., the echo of the Paschal feast, given to the Galilean multitudes; that of chap. x., in answer to the sentence of excommunication which the Sanhedrim had just levelled at His work; finally, those of chap. xiii. to xvii., intended to open up to the disciples the gates of the new world, at the moment when those of the present world were closing for Jesus. Five incomparable situations, and as exceptional, at least, as that of the return of the seventy disciples. Assuredly, if Jesus had never spoken save as He did in those solemn hours, He would not have attracted the multitudes to Himself, and His work would not have pierced into the Israelitish

[1] Wolff (*Das evang. des Joh. in seiner Bedeutung für Wissenschaft und Glauben*) expresses himself thus precisely: "In John, Jesus is *constantly* that which in the Synoptics He is only during some remarkable hours."

soil in such a way as to cause its roots to sink deeply therein. But, on the other hand, it is also equally true to say, that if He had never spoken as John makes Him speak, He could never have raised mankind to a religious level so absolutely superior to its former. The old world might, indeed, have received from His presence a celestial ray; but the divine world would not have been opened up. If it still be asked, How it happens that it is precisely those few discourses, uttered at those particular moments, which compose almost all the material of our Gospel? the answer is easy from our point of view. The author wished to reproduce those testimonies of the Lord which had opened up His true nature to his own eyes. And those testimonies were very naturally those which He had uttered in those extraordinary moments when He had openly expressed Himself concerning *heavenly things*, and not only as, in general, concerning earthly things regarded from the heavenly point of view. Moreover, let us not exaggerate that contrast. A palpable fact will prove that it is in reality only relative. I have quoted in the first edition of this commentary about twenty words which are almost identical in John and in the Synoptics (Luthardt has raised the number of them up to twenty-eight); now it is to be observed, that when one of the Gospels is read continuously and by itself, those words do not break the homogeneity of the text, nor would any reader conceive the idea of suspecting their authenticity any more in John than in the Synoptics.[1] Nothing can be observed in those words

[1] The following is the list of these passages:—

JOHN.	SYNOPTICS.
ii. 19: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up."	Matt. xxvi. 61 (xxvii. 40): "This fellow said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days" (Mark xiv. 58 and xv. 29).
iii. 18: "He that believeth on Him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already."	Mark xvi. 16: "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned."
iv. 44: "For Jesus Himself testified, that a prophet hath no honour in his own country."	Matt. xiii. 57: "Jesus said unto them, A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country, and in his own house" (Mark vi. 4 and Luke iv. 24).
v. 8: "Jesus saith unto him, Rise, take up thy bed, and walk."	Matt. ix. 6: "Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house" (Mark ii. 9; Luke v. 24).

which is out of harmony, either in idea or form, with those that precede and follow. What conclusion can be drawn from that but this, that words of so original a cast as those of Jesus may occur simultaneously in the two texts, Synoptic and Johannine, without breaking the web of it?—that the two texts are not so dissimilar as is alleged, and that the difference pointed out between them is only a very relative one. It is reduced to even smaller proportions still, if we take into account the

JOHN.	SYNOPTICS.
vi. 20: "It is I; be not afraid."	Matt. xiv. 27: "It is I; be not afraid" (Mark vi. 50).
vi. 35: "He that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst."	Matt. v. 6, Luke vi. 21: "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst: for they shall be filled."
vi. 37: "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out."	Matt. xi. 28, 29: "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden . . . and ye shall find rest unto your souls."
vi. 46: "Not that any man hath seen the Father, save He which is of God, He hath seen the Father." Compare i. 18: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him."	Matt. xi. 27: "No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him."
xii. 8: "For the poor always ye have with you; but me ye have not always."	Matt. xxvi. 11: "For ye have the poor always with you; but me ye have not always" (Mark xiv. 7).
xii. 25: "He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal."	Matt. x. 39: "He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it" (xvi. 25; Mark viii. 35; Luke ix. 24, xvii. 33).
xii. 27: "Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour."	Matt. xxvi. 38: "Then saith He unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death" (Mark xiv. 34 and following).
xiii. 3: "Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into His hands."	Matt. xi. 27: "All things are delivered unto me of my Father."
xiii. 16: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him."	Matt. x. 24: "The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord."
xiii. 20: "He that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth Him that sent me."	Matt. x. 40: "He that receiveth you, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth Him that sent me" (Luke x. 16).

threefold elaboration, by way of translation, condensation, and prolonged reminiscence which these discourses have necessarily undergone, as we have admitted at the beginning of this discussion. We shall show, further, by some special instances borrowed from Beyschlag, the value which we must place upon the decided contrasts which criticism has been often pleased to lay down between the style of Jesus in John and His manner of speaking in the Synoptics. The expressions

JOHN.	SYNOPTICS.
xiii. 21: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, That one of you shall betray me."	Matt. xxvi. 21: "Verily I say unto you, That one of you shall betray me" (Mark xiv. 18).
xiii. 38: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, The cock shall not crow, till thou hast denied me thrice."	Matt. xxvi. 34: "Verily I say unto thee, That this night, before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice" (Mark xiv. 30; Luke xxii. 34).
xiv. 18: "I will not leave you comfortless; I will come to you;" and 23: "We will make our abode with him."	Matt. xxviii. 20: "I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."
xiv. 28: "My Father is greater than I."	Mark xiii. 32: "Knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father."
xiv. 31: "Arise, let us go hence."	Matt. xxvi. 46: "Rise, let us be going."
xv. 20: "If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you."	Matt. x. 25: "If they have called the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of His household?"
xv. 21: "But all these things will they do unto you for my name's sake."	Matt. x. 22: "Ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake."
xvi. 32: "Behold, the hour cometh, yea, is now come, that ye shall be scattered, every one to his own, and shall leave me alone."	Matt. xxvi. 31: "For it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad."
xvii. 2: "As Thou hast given Him power over all flesh."	Matt. xxviii. 18: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth."
xviii. 11: "Put up thy sword into the sheath."	Matt. xxvi. 52; "Put up thy sword again into his place."
xviii. 20: "I ever taught in the synagogue, and in the temple."	Matt. xxvi. 55: "I sat daily with you teaching in the temple."
xviii. 37: "Pilate therefore said unto Him: Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born."	Matt. xxvii. 11: "And the governor asked Him, saying, Art thou the king of the Jews? And Jesus said unto him, Thou sayest."
xx. 23: "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted . . .," etc.	Matt. xviii. 18 (xvi. 19): "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven . . .," etc.

light and *darkness*, readily employed by John, contain nothing suspicious, since they are images already in use in the figurative style of the Old Testament. The expression *life, eternal life*, which, it is alleged, is characteristic of the style of the fourth Gospel, and has been substituted by its author for that of *kingdom of God*, or of *heaven*, in the Synoptics, on account of its spiritualistic tendency, is not only employed likewise in the latter, but employed *in room and place of the other*, and as its perfect equivalent.[1]

It is seen how much those weighty critical consequences are worth which writers have considered themselves authorized to draw from certain alleged differences of style, once thoughtlessly asserted, and henceforth repeated without examination. Criticism has so frequently made use of the comparison between the discrepancy which we are considering, and that which the Socrates of Xenophon and of Plato present, that we cannot refrain from likewise devoting some lines to that interesting subject. The analogy between the two facts is very remarkable. It is from Xenophon's narrative that we become acquainted with the varied, practical, and popular side of the teaching of Socrates; it is by means of Plato that we get a glimpse of the lofty speculative background which constitutes the basis, unknown to the common herd, of those dialogues full of animation and originality which Xenophon has preserved to us. Without the theory of ideas, concerning which the latter is silent, Socrates would never have attained to that firm attitude, that sovereign deportment, which Xenophon himself makes us admire in his master. And if the history of philosophy first flowed to the side of the Socrates of Xenophon, and regarded that of Plato as a speaking trumpet, selected by the latter to set forth his favourite theory, it has changed its mind at the present day.

Schleiermacher, Brandis, Ritter recognise that the close

[1] Matt. xviii. 3: "Ye *shall not enter* into *the kingdom of heaven.*"

Matt. xix. 17: "If thou wilt *enter into life.*"

Matt. xxv. 34: "Inherit the *kingdom prepared for you.*"

Mark ix. 45: "It is better for thee to *enter into life.*"

Ibid. ver. 8: "It is better for thee *to enter into life.*"

Ibid. ver. 23: "A rich man shall hardly *enter into the kingdom of heaven.*"

Ibid. ver. 46: "But the righteous *into life eternal.*"

Ibid. ver. 47: "It is better for thee to *enter into the kingdom of God.*"

connection which unites the school of Plato with the philosophy of Socrates would be inexplicable if the teaching of the latter had not comprised profounder speculative elements than anything which Xenophon has transmitted to us. It is in like manner on this condition only that we can account for the complete revolution wrought by Socrates on the progress of Greek thought. Thus science comprehends that the two pictures are equally legitimate, and seeks for a synthesis which will reunite them, and reproduce the image of the true and complete Socrates. Who would not be struck by the analogy between that historical phenomenon and the one which we are considering? As we have seen, the Jesus of the Synoptics is likewise an insoluble enigma if we do not admit, as lying at the foundation of Christ's consciousness, that sublime background of the feeling of an eternal existence, of a divine preexistence, which, from the period of His baptism, became the basis of his earthly activity, and which has been clearly disclosed to us only by John. The influence of Christ on the religious life of mankind is only intelligible on such a condition. If there was in the Greek sage the wherewithal to furnish two such different portraits, and yet one and both of them relatively true, how should it surprise us to see a similar result produced with respect to Him who possessed an infinitely superior richness of life and of thought, and who, if He had lived in the Greek world, could have said: Here is a greater than Socrates!

Philosophy still seeks the synthesis of the two Socrates: Theology searches, and will yet for a long period continue to search, for that of the two images of the Christ. It is its holiest task. And should it not succeed in its aim here below, it would not follow that the two images do not present two genuine aspects of the true Christ. The sunbeam reflected in the grass of the field emanates from the same sun as that which reproduces the image of that star in the waves of the ocean. And yet what a difference between these two reflections! There, the attractive variety of the manifold objects which the luminous ray makes resplendent to our eyes; here, the solemn and, if you will, monotonous majesty of the image of the solar disc in the calm and deep mirror of the waters. And, nevertheless, behind those two reflections

there is one and the same sun; it is the mirrors which are different. The Christ of the Synoptics and that of John, very far from excluding, mutually require each other, as two aspects simultaneously true of the unfathomable Being of whom the Synoptics themselves tell us: "No man knoweth *the Son*, save the Father."

3. But another objection, not less serious, perhaps, in the eyes of many, awaits us on another side: How does it happen that if it is really Jesus who speaks in the discourses which are attributed to Him, that He speaks exactly like John the Baptist (i. 15, 29, 30, iii. 27–36), exactly like the man born blind (chap. ix.), precisely like the evangelist himself in the prologue of his Gospel (i. 1–18) and in his Epistle.

Let us, above all, remember that the translator of the discourses of Jesus is one and the same person with the author of the Gospel. Let a German preacher publish a sermon of his own composition in its original language, adding to it the translation made by him of a discourse on the same subject delivered by a French preacher, are we not to believe that the style of one of these discourses would resemble that of the other, that by means of that uniform tinge the two writings would become in some sort one and the same work, and that it would be unjust to deduce from such inevitable conformity any doubts concerning the fidelity of the translating author? Such is the relation between the discourses reproduced in Greek by the evangelist, and the prologue or the Epistle composed by him.

From this general remark, let us pass on to questions of detail. In regard to the words of the man born blind, we possess only some replies full of spirit and good sense; the attempt to establish a conformity between them and the discourses of Jesus is not a serious one.

The words of John the Baptist? It is regarded as impossible that he should have taught the pre-existence of the Messiah, and should have said (i. 15): "For He was before me." But that idea proceeded directly from the passage of the Old Testament on which his own mission was founded (Mal. iii. 1), and where Jehovah thus speaks: "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way *before me*: and *the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to His temple.*" If

in accordance with these passages, it is Jehovah who has sent the forerunner before Him, and who follows him in the course of time as the Messiah, it is evident that John must regard that Messiah from whom His messenger proceeds as having existed before him. In regard to the discourse of John the Baptist, iii. 27 ff., many interpreters believe that they can only defend its historical truth by refusing to the forerunner all that follows the thirtieth verse, and by regarding that conclusion as a meditation of the evangelist. Here, no more than for the close of the conversation with Nicodemus, can we admit such a solution. And first, the central words of the entire discourse, "He must increase, but I must decrease," are not such as are invented. Now the first proposition of that declaration is the text of what precedes that verse, as the second is the text of all that follows. The discourse thus forms an indivisible whole, the two parts of which are the pendants of each other: the friend of the bridegroom (vv. 27–29); the bridegroom (vv. 31–36). That correlation does not allow us to doubt the authenticity of the second part. Moreover, the idea expressed in ver. 34, that it is the Spirit of God who inspires Jesus with the words He utters, is too foreign to the manner in which Jesus usually speaks of Himself, and reflects too much the Old Testament point of view (as Beyschlag has observed), for such words to have proceeded from the evangelist. Further, the last words: "But the wrath of God abideth on him," in like manner, are very appropriate to the position of John the Baptist as the last representative of the Old Testament. He had begun his career with a threat: "Who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" (Matt. iii. 7.) He ends with a threat, which reproduces the last words of the Old Testament in Malachi: "Lest I come and smite the earth with a curse." The conformity of several expressions in vv. 32 and 36 with the words of Jesus in the interview with Nicodemus, is explained by the forerunner himself, when he compares himself to the friend of the bridegroom, who stands at a distance, and "rejoiceth greatly *because of the bridegroom's voice*" (ver. 29). Some of the most striking words of Jesus had then been reported to him. His former disciples, Andrew, Peter, John himself, profiting by the proximity of the localities where

Jesus and John were baptizing, had given the latter an account of that interview, at which there was nothing to prevent some one of them from having been present. Finally, as to the words: "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into His hand," they are only the echo of the divine voice in the vision at the baptism, in which John had taken part. Thus, neither as regards contents nor form does that discourse present to the severest criticism any insurmountable difficulties.

The connection between the discourses of Jesus and the prologue of John do not surprise us, if the second is only a summary of the first. We have already brought under the notice of the attentive reader that remarkable fact, that the term Logos, inscribed by the evangelist at the head of the prologue, does not reappear in the discourses of Jesus. Nothing affords us a better proof of the fidelity of the writer. Keim seeks wholly in vain to weaken the import of that fact, and even to take advantage of it at the expense of the evangelist. "He had sufficient tact," he says (p. 124), "not to clumsily obtrude on the history that favourite technical expression." The evangelist here decidedly appears before a judge resolved to condemn him, whatever he may do. Weizsäcker is more impartial. "Throughout the whole Gospel," he says, "Jesus does not designate Himself as the divine Logos, and no well-grounded objection can be brought forward against the value of that fact. . . . The absence of this expression is all the more surprising, that in the discourses of Jesus the expression '*word of God*' frequently designates the revealed truth (comp. v. 38, x. 35, xii. 48, etc.). The difference between the use of that word in the prologue and in the discourses of Jesus is then well marked, and there can be no doubt that the author is fully conscious that he is establishing that distinction between the discourses of Jesus and the general idea which predominates in his narrative" (pp. 256–258).

There still remains the objection raised by the resemblance of the discourses with the first Epistle, from the point of view of contents and style. The conformity of style must specially be explained by the circumstance indicated above; the pen which wrote the Epistle translated the discourses. That of the contents is explained by the natural dependence in which the

thoughts of John found themselves in respect to those of Jesus. The one was born of the other,—its reflection, as it were.

M. Henri Meyer makes out a kind of impoverishment in the vocabulary of the Epistle, compared with that of the discourses. Some thirty substantives, a score of verbs, four or five adjectives, such is the entire linguistic basis of the Epistle. What a difference from the discourses! He brings prominently out, moreover, the absence of those lively, picturesque, original images with which the discourses abound. The language of the Epistle has a continuously abstract character. It is now acknowledged that the Epistle cannot be attributed to any other writer than the evangelist. Even Hilgenfeld gives up in this respect the attempt of Baur to attribute the two writings to different authors,—an idea which he had at one time shared. Only he admits that the author has on several points changed his manner of looking at matters, between the drawing up of the Epistle, which is the oldest writing, and that of the Gospel. But that supposition can no longer be maintained. There is a vigour of style and of thought in the Gospel which is not to be found in the Epistle, and which impels us to place the composition of the former before that of the latter. Now, from a doctrinal point of view, what do we find in both writings? In the discourses of the Gospel, any more than in those of the Synoptics, the expiatory value of the death of Jesus is not dwelt upon, and yet this is one of the doctrines which are expounded with marked preference in the Epistle. In the discourses of the Gospel no mention is made of Antichrist, whose coming plays so important a part in the Epistle. In the discourses of the Gospel, the final advent of the Lord is supposed, but not specially brought forward (v. 28), whilst the author of the Epistle is constantly making that great fact to hover before the mind of his readers. How is it possible not to recognise here the profound respect of the author of the two writings for the line of demarcation which, in his consciousness, separated his own Christian reflections from the thoughts which he had heard Jesus express in His discourses?

The same conclusion results from two other not less remarkable differences. Whilst the discourses of Jesus are distin-

guished by their powerful, steady, and ever upward flight, there is in the progress of the Epistle something slow, sluggish, hesitating. We can readily distinguish some cycles in that composition; but within each of these sections, which are with difficulty capable of being apprehended, are frequently reproduced those ideas which are expressed in a slightly different form in another cycle. It is not a progress towards an end, it is a spiritual promenade. We feel that the thought of the author, after having been nourished by a superior mind, is here no longer supported by it; and that for that reason the firm attitude is wanting which the latter imparted to it. The Epistle is precisely what the discourses in the Gospel would be if they had been composed in the manner which our modern critics have imagined. The other difference to be noted is this: the religious truths taught in the didactic portions of the Gospel are imparted under an historical, occasional form, adapted to the circumstance in view of which Jesus speaks; they have an appropriate, practical, real character. In the Epistle, on the contrary, the same thoughts are set forth, if I may so say, *in abstracto*. The historical attitude is wanting; they present themselves as a species of Christian philosophy.

For instance, in the Gospel, Jesus says: "For *God so loved* the world, that He gave His only-begotten Son," or, "*Thou lovedst me* before the foundation of the world;" in the Epistle, John says: "God is love." In the Gospel, Jesus says: "Ye are of your father the devil; and *the lusts of your father ye will do*;" in the Epistle, John says: "*He that committeth sin* is of the devil." In the Gospel, Jesus says: "I pray not that Thou shouldest *take them out of the world*, but that Thou shouldest *keep them* from the evil;" in the Epistle, John says: "*The whole world lieth in wickedness*." In the Gospel, Jesus says to the disciples: "*Ye* have not chosen me, but *I* have chosen you;" in the Epistle, John says: "Herein is love, *not that we loved* God, but that *He loved us*." In the Gospel, Jesus says: "But I have greater *witness* than that of John [the Baptist];" in the Epistle, John says: "*If we receive* the witness of men, the witness *of God* is greater." We could prolong that enumeration of parallel expressions. They would all lead us to this conclusion, that the contents of the Epistle are a quintessence, extracted by the author from the historical declara-

tions of his Master in the Gospel. What the Book of Proverbs is, as an expression of Israelitish wisdom in reference to the ensemble of the Jewish history, the first Epistle of John is in respect to the history and teaching of Jesus.

In face of these facts, we think that we are on our side well entitled to infer from the Epistle itself the fidelity and accuracy with which the author has reproduced the discourses of Jesus in the Gospel.

The three classes of objections which we have examined thus disappear on a thorough investigation, and even transform themselves, in more than one instance, into a homage to the truth of the thesis which they were intended to overturn,—that of the historical truth of the Gospel in its twofold contents, historical and didactic. Two historical reasons may, in addition, be stated in support of such a conclusion: 1st. How can we escape being struck by that multitude of minute chronological and topographical details which accompany the narrative of those discourses? One of these discourses was delivered at Bethany, on the banks of the Jordan (i. 28); another by the margin of a well (iv. 6); another was occasioned by the approach of the Passover, and was delivered in the Synagogue of Capernaum (vi. 4, 59); another in the midst of a festival week; the following on the last great day of that feast (vii. 14 and 37); another in the treasury of the temple (viii. 20); yet another in Solomon's Porch, because it was winter (x. 22, 23). The series of discourses spoken in the upper chamber was suddenly interrupted by these words: "Arise, let us go hence" (xiv. 31), which indicates that moment in the evening when Jesus broke off and set out for the valley of Cedron. "A thoughtful author," says M. Meyer, "would not have scattered throughout the discourses which he narrates any such indications, if these indications had not corresponded to precise historical recollections" (p. 80). 2d. The discourses of Jesus in our Gospel are not, as it is desired to maintain, portions of theology, forming a whole, and capable of being detached from the narrative properly so called, as the vowel points form in a Hebrew writing a whole, independent of the consonants. The discourses are one of the elements of action; they are even the most decisive factor in it, since it is for the crime of

blasphemy that Jesus was put to death. The reality of the catastrophe guarantees, then, in a general way, that of the discourses which called it forth.

To establish the character of historical truth which our Gospel possesses, we have hitherto appealed to exegetical and historical facts. It may still be permitted to us further to urge, before concluding, some psychological and moral considerations.

And, first of all, if the author really wishes, as he affirms (xx. 30, 31), to make his readers understand by what facts and what proofs he has been led to the faith which he preaches in the world, how can we admit that, with such an aim, he states facts which he knows are not true, discourses which he knew had never been uttered? We see him in an ecstasy at that breaking of the legs of the malefactors from which Jesus escapes, and admiring in that act the simultaneous fulfilment of two prophecies; and could that act be his own invention? The author, in fixing the death of Jesus on the 14th Nisan, the day of the sacrifice of the lamb, makes us observe how, by that coincidence, God has pointed Jesus out as the true Paschal Lamb; and could that coincidence be his work? To give rise to it, he must, on his own responsibility, have overturned the chronology of the Synoptics! Is not M. Beyschlag right in asserting, that thus to lay the foundation of his own faith and that of the church on his own inventions is a procedure which would belong, not to the domain of sacred and profane literature, but to that of madness?

Here we run against a psychological impossibility. Now here follows a moral impossibility. In reference to the names of Peter and Malchus, whom John alone mentions in the scene of Gethsemane, Keim says that if the Synoptics had known them they would not have omitted them; that our author, in consequence, has added them of his own accord, "in order to have the appearance of being well informed, perhaps of being more so than his predecessors." Let us pass over that imposition, so full of calculation. But the name of Peter. What! Make use of the name of the chief of the apostles to make himself pass for being well informed, when he is not so at all!

Another procedure: The author, in chap. xii. 37–50, bases the unpardonable guilt of the Jews on the miracles which he had related, and which had not convinced them; on the discourses which he had delivered, and which had not converted them. "But though He had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on Him" (ver. 37). "Jesus cried and said" . . . (ver. 44). And these miracles and these discourses, on account of which he utters the condemnation of the Jews, he himself invented them! We still wait until we are shown to what category of psychological and moral phenomena such conduct belongs! Finally, he makes Christ Himself utter such declarations as the following: "For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father, which sent me, He gave me a commandment what I should say and what I should speak" (xii. 49); "But as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things" (viii. 28); and it is the author who makes Him so speak, and who specially puts in His mouth that declaration, that He says only what the Father has told Him! To what refinement of imposture or of folly have we come!

M. Scholten gives us as an answer the example of the historical romances of Walter Scott; M. Reville, that of Plato's dialogues. But did Walter Scott ask that his creations should be taken in earnest? and did Plato suppose that his teachings were to be regarded as articles of faith?

I trust I have proved, in regard to the facts:

1st. That the idea of the Logos did not exist in the mind of the author, detached from the person of Jesus, in such a way as to enable him to form an ideal picture of His person and His history; but that it was derived by him from the person and the history of Jesus, and supposes both the one and the other.

2d. That in every instance where there is real difference between the fourth Gospel and the Synoptics, it is certainly to the former that the historical superiority belongs.

3d. That the supposition, according to which the author would himself be the inventor of the facts which he narrates, is equivalent to a psychological impossibility.

In reference to the discourses:

1st. That they present very striking characteristics of his-

torical reality, and that the progress of the conflict cannot be understood without them.

2d. That the difference of thought and of style from the Synoptic teaching is only relative, since each of the two forms includes elements so homogeneous to those of the other, that it becomes easy to construct a bridge between them.

3d. That the supposition, according to which the author would knowingly have put into the mouth of Jesus discourses which He had never uttered, embraces a moral impossibility.

It is, then, with a positive conviction that we claim for the narrative of our Gospel in its two essential elements the *character of historical truth.*

II.

Theological Characteristics.

The Theological point of view which is predominant in the narrative of the Fourth Gospel has been variously estimated by modern criticism. Baur has specially pointed out in that work a strongly *anti-Judaic* tendency; he next discovered in it a *Gnostic* and even *Docetic* tinge. Our Gospel, moreover, appears to him to substitute for the old Pauline antagonism between faith and works, a new and vaster contrast: that of light and darkness, to which the progress of the whole moral world is subjected. Finally, he finds this characteristic difference between St. Paul and our pseudo-John: In the latter, the loftiest notion is that of love in God; whilst, however highly such a notion may be ranked by Paul, that of righteousness advances on an equality with it. Thence it results, that the object of faith in Paul is the fact of the death of Jesus; whilst in John it is His person itself, in the totality of its appearance, and in its absolute value.[1] Hilgenfeld brings out three principal points in the theology of our Gospel: 1st. It is in the highest degree *anti-Judaic;* 2d. It has the impress of *Alexandrinism;* 3d. Finally, it proceeds a good way with *Gnosticism,* especially with the system of Valentinus.[2] Reuss and Beyschlag believe that traces are to

[1] *Das Christenth. und die Christl. Kirche der drei ersten Jahrh.*, p. 171.

[2] Hilgenfeld has devoted a special chapter to this subject in his *Introduction to the N. T.*

be found in our Gospel of two different, even opposite, ways of speaking of the person of the Lord: "The metaphysical method of speaking [in that Gospel]," says M. Reuss, "is constantly crossed by a popular way of speaking which contradicts it, so that we are led to regard it as a borrowed element, strictly foreign to the mind of the author" (sec. 225). "Where we meet with the language of the schools, that belongs to the evangelist; when Jesus speaks, we find the language of life" (sec. 220). Beyschlag passes an almost similar judgment: "The evangelist met with upon his way, amid the surroundings in which he lived, the notion of the Logos, and applied it to Jesus without taking into account the contradiction embraced in the idea of a divine being who eats, drinks, sleeps, grows weary, weeps, prays, and dies." Beyschlag goes so far even as to draw from that very contradiction a proof in favour of the historical truth of the fourth Gospel; for the philosophical theorem of the Logos cannot have been the source of that history, since the latter does not harmonize with it.

Let us begin with the anti-Judaic tendency, which is the one most generally alleged. It betrays itself, we are assured, in the following features: in that scornful expression, *your law*, which Jesus so frequently employs in speaking to the Jews; in the contempt which He evidences on every occasion for the ordinances relating to the Sabbath; in such declarations as the following: "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work" (v. 17), by which He designedly combats the notion of the divine rest expressed in Genesis; or such as this other, "All that ever came before me were thieves and robbers" (x. 8), words by which He breaks away from the whole theocratic development; in that expression, "*the Jews*," appropriated in our Gospel as the designation of the enemies of the light; finally, in the complete parity which Jesus establishes between the Jewish and the Samaritan mode of worship, when He declares the one to be as erroneous as the other (iv. 21), and when He announces their mutual disappearance, at the coming of the worship in spirit and in truth.[1]

That estimate seems to us to come into collision with the

[1] Comp. Hilgenfeld, *Einl.* pp. 722 and 723.

following facts. From the very first the Jewish people is brought into a most special relation of intimacy with the Eternal Word: "*He came unto His own*" (i. 11). M. Reuss, indeed, attempts to apply that expression, "*His own*," to men in general. But it is evident from ver. 6, where John the Baptist has been introduced on the stage, that it refers to the people of Israel, and to them alone.[1] The same idea is expressed in chap. x., where to the sheep brought from the theocratic fold are gathered together those whom the shepherd draws from the other enclosures of the whole world. The Jewish economy could not be presented more clearly as the preparatory institution of the kingdom of God. Moreover, Jesus, in His reply to Nathanael, makes the name of Israelite a true title of honour. It is not possible, then, that when Jesus says to the Jews, "*your law*," that expression was inspired by a feeling of contempt. It happens even on one occasion, that immediately after Jesus had expressed Himself in that way, He adds: "And the Scripture cannot be broken" (x. 34, 35). And, nevertheless, the point in question there refers to the somewhat accidental expression of a Psalmist, which might be explained by the poetical character of the passage! That saying of Jesus is certainly equivalent to that energetic protestation in the Synoptics in favour of the inviolability of the law: "One jot or one tittle shall in nowise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." If Jesus said to the Jews, "*your law*," it is really because He could not express Himself in any other way. It would have been derogatory on His part to say: "*our* law," quite as much as, when speaking of God, to say: "*our* Father."[2] His relation to the law, as well as His relation to God, differed too much from that of the Jews to allow them to be included in the same expression. By virtue of the internal conformity of His will with the spirit of the law, Jesus was in a very different relation to that institution from those on whom it was outwardly imposed. It is true He might, indeed, have said, "*the law*." But the

[1] The 12th verse can prove nothing against this interpretation, for the expression, "those who received Him," relates to the believing members of the chosen people, who become the nucleus of the church in general (comp. the *we all* of ver. 16).

[2] Comp. xx. 17, where He says: "My Father and your Father," and not "*our* Father."

term "*your*" rendered the argument more pointed: "The law which you yourselves recognise, and which you dare to make a weapon of against me." He, in like manner, calls Abraham "*your* Father," and that in a passage where He certainly had no intention of disparaging that patriarch (viii. 56)! —The Mosaic institution of the Sabbath was never really violated by Jesus. What He infringed without any scruples were those arbitrary statutes with which the Rabbis had encompassed the divine commandment *as with a hedge*, according to their own expression. And that procedure of Jesus is found to be precisely the same in the Synoptics.—In the words contained in chap. v. 17, Jesus has no intention whatever of combating the idea of the rest alluded to in Genesis. The point in question in that passage does not refer to the activity of God in the domain of nature, but to the work of the Father in the sphere of moral education, and of the redemption of mankind, —work which began precisely afterwards, and on the basis of the cessation of the creative work.—The superiority of Judaism over the Samaritan mode of worship is positively attested by Jesus in the very passage from which it is maintained that their complete parity may be inferred (iv. 21 ff.). Does not Jesus affirm that "salvation is of the Jews"? And whilst thus making of the Jewish people the consecrated cradle of the salvation of mankind, Jesus attributes to Israel a superiority of religious knowledge in harmony with that high destiny.

Of the Samaritans He says: "*Ye* worship *ye* know not what;" of the Jews: "*We* know what *we* worship." It is true that Hilgenfeld endeavours to apply that *we* to Jesus alone, and the preceding "*ye*" to the Jews and Samaritans conjoined; but that sense is not admissible. Jesus replies to the words of the Samaritan woman who has just opposed this idea: "Our fathers worshipped;" to the latter: "*Ye* (Jews) say." And it needs a remarkable amount of party prejudice not to perceive that this is the same opposition which is carried out in the answer of Jesus.[1] The unfavourable mean-

[1] The reason which Hilgenfeld deduces from the words, "Ye shall no longer . . . worship," ver. 21, which seem to include Jews and Samaritans in one, fails if these words are applied, as they ought to be, to the Samaritans alone. "Ye shall no longer worship on this mountain, nor will you *be constrained* to go to worship at Jerusalem."

ing which in our Gospel is usually attached to the expression, "*the Jews*," is easily explained after the consummation of the rupture between the church and the synagogue, and after the fall of Jerusalem. That latter event had deprived the Jewish nation of all political existence, and had left to it only its religious character. Now this character, from the position which the people had taken, had become the most pronounced anti-Christianity. Such is the point of view which predominates throughout the whole of our narrative, and which explains the unfavourable meaning of that name. It is absolutely impossible to suppose that Jesus means to regard as *thieves* and *robbers* all the ancient directors of the theocratic work,—he who speaks of Abraham, of Moses, of the Psalmist, and of the prophets as He has done in many passages (v. 38, 39, 45–47, vi. 45, viii. 18, 39, 40, 56, etc.). The saying of Jesus on which it is sought to fix this forced signification (x. 8) applies to the rulers of the Jewish nation who had immediately preceded Jesus, who, after the theocracy had been deprived of its rulers instituted by God, the kings and prophets, had constituted themselves its sovereigns, and in name of their theological knowledge ruled it as despots, without that authority having any divine mission to rest on.

All such interpretations of a partial criticism encounter, moreover, an insurmountable obstacle in the continual employment of the types of the Old Testament, which constitute the topics of the Messianic testimonies of Jesus. Jesus represents Himself as the *true temple*, chap. ii.; as the veritable *brazen serpent*, chap. iii. Farther on He applies to Himself the types of the *pool of Bethesda*, near the temple, chap. v.; of the gift of *manna* in the wilderness, chap. vi.; of the water from the *rock*, and *the pillar of fire*, chap. vii. and viii.; then of the pool of *Siloam*, chap. ix.; of the *theocratic shepherd*, chap. x.; of the King of Israel making His humble entry into His capital, chap. xii.; finally, of the *Paschal Lamb*, chap. xviii. and xix. All these discourses may thus be summed up in one word: "I *am* the reality of many a symbol." Could the divine character of those acts and prophetic words be more strikingly attested? In short, what is the meaning of those words, v. 46, 47: "For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his

writings, how shall ye believe my words?" Is it possible to affirm in a more energetic manner the perfect unity of the law and the Gospel, the moral and religious homogeneity of Judaism and Christianity? Every true disciple of the law must necessarily become a Christian; every Jew who is an enemy of the Gospel is only so because he has internally rejected the spirit of the law. Such is the relation of the two economies according to the fourth Gospel; and yet serious critics are to be found capable of asserting the anti-Judaic character of such a work!

It is a strange statement when Baur maintains that the author stands at such a height that he no longer concerns himself with the antagonism between faith and works! But how does that assertion agree with the alleged anti-Judaic tendency of this same author? If he no longer considers it necessary to combat a righteousness resulting from works, in what does his anti-Judaism consist? The truth is, that for the evangelist as for St. Paul (Rom. xiii. 8, 9 and elsewhere), as well as for Jesus Himself (Matt. v. 17), there is only one normal abolition of the law, and that is its very fulfilment. The letter of the law ought only to perish with the presence of its spirit in the heart. One of the expressions most commonly employed by that author, "*keep the commandments*," makes the whole moral substance of the law reappear in the Gospel; but now identified, by faith in Christ, with the subjective will of the believer. That is the solution of the contrast already implied in that answer of Jesus to the Jews who said to Him: "What shall we do that we might work *the works* of God?" "This is the work of God, that ye believe." To believe, is to give oneself; to give oneself, is to give all. Faith is consequently the realization of the work demanded by the law.

A Judæo-Alexandrine character, moreover, is attributed to our Gospel. Amongst the enlightened classes of the numerous Jewish population established in Egypt, and particularly at Alexandria, a peculiar philosophy had developed itself. The cultured Jews very naturally sought to establish a connection between those religious beliefs drawn from the Old Testament, and the grand systems created by Greek wisdom. With that view, they interpreted the facts of sacred history in an alle-

gorical sense; they made of them the symbols of certain speculative principles; they even went so far as to allege that the principal Grecian philosophers had borrowed their wisdom from Moses. Their tendency to Monotheism was only a reflection of the Israelitish Monotheism. The leading representative of that Judæo-Alexandrine philosophy, in the first century of our era, was Philo, a member of a wealthy Jewish-Alexandrian family. In his numerous treatises on all kinds of philosophical and religious subjects, that writer unfolded a theory, according to which God, the absolute Being, of whom nothing can be affirmed, cannot enter into any relation with matter. Outside of Him, indeed, there exists eternal matter, without form and void. The world, such as we know it, could not then have been produced, if, between this God and this matter, a mediating principle did not intervene, the divine reason, the Logos.[1] In that Logos are comprised all the ideas of finite things; and it is He who, by causing those ideas to penetrate into matter, where they ought to be realized, is the author of the sensible world. God remains a stranger to that contact, which for Him would involve contamination.

Is the Logos regarded by Philo as an impersonal or a personal Being? That is a question which the ambiguous and often contradictory expressions of that author do not allow us to decide; and Zeller has clearly demonstrated the cause of such ambiguity of language. It arises from a want of clearness inherent in the very idea of that Being. On the one hand, the Logos must belong to the essence of God, which seems to give to it the character of a simple attribute of the Divine Being, and to exclude personality; on the other, it must necessarily be in relation with matter to cause the divine types of finite things to penetrate into it,—an office which implies a Being distinct from God, and, in consequence, a personal one. The very names by which Philo designates the Logos reproduce that contradiction. Sometimes, as a disciple of Plato, he calls it the *idea of ideas* (ἰδέα ἰδεῶν); sometimes, in language which is rather that of the Stoics, he designates it as "the reason which is diffused amongst all beings in common" (ὁ κοινὸς λόγος ὁ διὰ πάντων ἐρχόμενος); at other times, speak-

[1] A word which in Greek signifies sometimes *reason* (in itself), sometimes *discourse*,—that is to say, reason by way of manifestation.

ing rather as a Jew, he bestows on it the titles of *archangel*, of *high priest*, of *son* (that name was likewise applied by Plato to the world), of *first-born Logos*, of *second God* (ἀρχάγγελος, ἀρχιερεύς, λόγος, υἱός, πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ λόγος, δεύτερος Θεός). On the whole, it seems to us that we cannot express ourselves better than in the words of Niedner: "There is no passage which demands, whilst there are several which exclude, the hypostatic (personal) distinction between God and the Logos."[1]

The types of things contained in the divine reason also receive from Philo names borrowed from these different philosophical schools. He calls them *ideas*, after Plato; *causes*, after the Stoics; *demons*, according to an expression borrowed from the popular Greek language; finally, *angels*, when he comes back to his Israelitish vocabulary. He once says: "The immortal *ideas* (ἀθάνατοι λόγοι) which we (Jews) call angels."[2]

Has Philo ever brought the theory of the Logos into relation with the Jewish expectation of the Messiah? It does not appear so. According to Philo,[3] the Messiah was to be merely a simple Israelite, making war against great nations, and subduing them by the help of God: his dominion was to increase every day. There is here no point of contact with the doctrine of the Logos.

The question now is this: Has that Judæo-Alexandrine wisdom, whose influence we believe we can demonstrate on one book of the New Testament, the Epistle to the Hebrews, also imprinted its stamp on the theology of our fourth evangelist? An entire school of criticism maintains, at the present day, that the doctrine of the Logos, with which our Gospel opens, can only be a loan, borrowed from that Alexandrine wisdom. But a certain number of facts do not seem to agree with such a supposition.

1. And, first of all, the very meaning of the word *Logos*. That word was employed in the Stoic philosophy to designate the divine *intelligence* with which the whole world is pervaded; and amongst the Neo-Pythagoreans, to designate the divine

[1] *De subsistentia τῷ θείῳ λόγῳ apud Philonem tributa*, Quaest. Phil. ii. p. 3.

[2] See the fine exposition of Philo's doctrine in the work of M. Emile Schürer, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte*, pp. 653–665.

[3] See the work of M. Wabnitz, *Theological Review*, 1874, p. 153.

type, according to which the world was created.[1] That meaning of *reason* is to so great a degree the meaning of the word Logos in Philo, that when he wishes to give it that of *word*, as in the passages in which he puts that philosophical theorem in relation with the biblical narrative of the creation, he is careful to add to the term Logos the Greek word which specially signifies *word* (ῥῆμα).[2] He says, for instance, "God makes both (intelligence, of which heaven is the symbol, and sensation typified by the earth) *by His* illustrious and resplendent *Logos-word*" (λόγῳ ῥήματι). We find exactly the opposite in the Johannine prologue. The meaning of the word Logos is here, as in all Holy Scripture, in the LXX., that of *word*. This results from the unquestionable allusion to Gen. i. 1. In that passage there would be already good ground for the presumption that this expression has a quite different origin from the writings of Philo, and an altogether different stream of ideas from that of philosophy in general.

2. The God who has the Logos as agent is in Philo an absolutely transcendent Being, who cannot hold, without derogation, any communication with the finite world except by means of the Logos. The God of Philo is the pure idea, the being within himself, altogether indeterminable. In John, God is a living person, a being full of life, of will, of love, a Father who loves the world so as even to bestow His Son upon it. He enters into so direct a relation with the world, that it is He who, by His attractions and His inner teaching, leads souls to *the Son*;[3] He who bears witness to Him by working out for Him sensible prodigies in nature (v. 37); He who makes a voice, externally audible, resound in answer to His prayer (xii. 28). The Father is to such a degree, contrary to Philo's theory, the medium between men and the Logos, that Jesus goes so far as to say to Him: "*Thine* they were, and *Thou* gavest them me" (xvii. 6). What an offence would

[1] See the learned work of M. Max Heinze, *Die Lehre vom Logos in der Griechischen Philosophie*, 1872.

[2] M. Heinze endeavours to prove from some passages that the term Logos alone has also that meaning of *word* in Philo, in some rare instances; but he does not appear to me to have succeeded in his aim.

[3] vi. 44: "No man can come unto me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him." Ver. 37: "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me."

such a thought be considered in the eyes of Philo! It is the antipodes of his system.

3. Philo's Logos arranges and preserves *the world* in general. It is a universal principle, which is not brought into any relation with the theocracy and with the appearance in history of the Jewish Messiah. The Messiah in John is the Logos Himself, the well-beloved of the Father, who unites Himself to humanity, and clothes Himself with a body, in order to save the world. What becomes of the abhorrence of matter, the basis of Philo's system? and what relation is there between the mediation of that Son, who becomes incarnate in order to save, and that of the Logos of Philo, who has a relation only to the work of creation, and reference only to the universe as such? The origin of the theory of the Logos in Philo is metaphysical. A second God is needed by him to intervene between the absolute God and the finite world. In John, the existence of the Logos is not a matter of metaphysical necessity, it is an act of love, the love of the Father for the Son (xvii. 24: "Thou hast loved me before the creation of the world"); then of the love of the Father for the world, to which He gives the Son (iii. 16).

4. Eternal matter is in Philo the principle of evil. The Logos finds it before Him, and seeks to turn it to the best possible account by causing it to be penetrated by divine ideas. In John, on the contrary, nothing exists alongside of God and of the Logos, which forms part of His eternal essence; and it is He who creates all things, matter as well as everything else. M. Scholten alleges, it is true, that he finds the shapeless and obscure matter of Philo in that darkness of which it is said, i. 5: "The light shineth in the darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not." But the creation of the world and of mankind had been already indicated in vers. 3 and 4, before the mention of that darkness, which did not appear till after mankind had been introduced on the stage. The latter—thanks to the Word from which it emanates—enjoyed for a while life and light in union with the Logos. The darkness, then, in the mind of the author could only be that of sin, an obscuration of the whole moral nature, the product of human liberty.

All those features opposed to Philo's system force us to

seek for John's prologue another source than that Alexandrine wisdom. The latter emanates, on the one hand, from Grecian philosophy; on the other, from texts of the Old Testament,—two elements which Philo vainly tried to blend into a homogeneous whole. It was in this way that he came to dress up with the name of *angels* the *ideas* of Plato, that he applied the titles of *archangel*, of *high priest*, etc., to the divine intelligence, which, according to Anaxagoras, Socrates, Plato, etc., penetrates and governs all. The evangelist does precisely the contrary. He rests exclusively on Jewish and Christian ground; it is there that he finds the *idea* of the Son, and even the term *Word* to designate that idea. And if there is in him any accommodation whatever to the Alexandrine wisdom, it limits itself to the *use* which he makes of that term, the knowledge of which he has obtained elsewhere.

In fact, the idea arises from the discourses of Jesus. In them is revealed the existence of a living, personal Being, the object of the divine love "before Abraham was" (viii. 58), and saluted by God Himself at the hour of baptism in these words, "Thou art my well-beloved Son." How is such a Being to be designated? Here a name as unique as His person was required. Jesus had styled Himself simply *the Son of man*, when He wished to characterize His relations with mankind; and the *Son of God*, or *the Son* briefly, when He wished to designate His mysterious relationship to God. The evangelist, in order to find the exceptional designation for which he searches, and which is to reunite these two relations, interrogates the Old Testament, such as it is read and expounded in the Synagogues frequented by him from his youth. In the Mosaic narrative, the work of creation is attributed to the Word (to the Logos) of God, Gen. i In ver. 26 God appears to converse with a Being who is associated with Him in His work: "*Let us make* man in *our* image." In Exodus (xxiii. 21), God, speaking of the person called the Angel of Jehovah (the Eternal), says of Him, "My name" (the reflection of my inmost essence) "is in Him." The Proverbs speak of a Wisdom of God (chap. viii.) "which the Lord possessed in the beginning of His way, before His works of old" (ver. 22). "Then I was by Him, rejoicing always before Him" (ver. 30). The learned Jews had not neglected

those indications. They had taken the liberty of introducing that idea into the Aramæan paraphrases of the Old Testament [Targums] which were publicly read in the synagogues, substituting the name of *the Word of Jehovah* (the Eternal) for that of *Jehovah* each time that God manifested Himself in a sensible manner and in nature. Thus, where it is said that Jehovah was with Joseph in prison, they thus express the text in the paraphrase: "*the Memra* (the Word) was with Joseph;" whilst in Ps. cx. 1 it is to the Memra that Jehovah addresses those words: "Sit Thou at my right hand:" it is the Memra which, as the destroying angel, caused the first-born in Egypt to die; and finally, it is it which, dwelling in the cloud, led the Israelites through the wilderness. They had found the confirmation of the existence of that mysterious personality in several passages. Thus in Ps. cviii. 20: "He sent His Word (like a heavenly physician) and healed them." In cxlvii. 15: "He sendeth forth His commandment upon earth: His Word runneth very swiftly." In Isa. lv. 11: "My Word . . . shall accomplish that which I please." These learned men had found a name, a biblical name, for that Being,—that of *Memra di Jehovah;* that is to say, *Word,* or *Logos, of Jehovah.*

Such is the true stream which ended in the prologue of John. And what confirms it is, that we find this stream once more, and on this occasion quite independent of the Alexandrine term "Logos," in those words of St. Paul, 1 Cor. x. 4: "For they drank (in the wilderness) of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ;" and in viii. 6: "But to us one Lord Jesus Christ, *by whom are all things,* and we by Him." What has Philo and his metaphysical terminology to do here? Do not these exclusively biblical, Jewish, and Palestinean antecedents suffice to explain the origin of the word *Logos* in John? That word is the literal Greek translation of the rabbinical term "*Memra,*"—a term already in use in the time of Jesus to designate the manifestations of the Divine Being, and which presented itself quite naturally to express the supreme divine manifestation which the apostles had recognised in the person of Jesus.

That the author, in inscribing that term on the head of his work, may have intended to throw a bridge between the

Gospel which he preached and the theories which were in circulation around him when he wrote, is possible, even probable, as we shall see. But the origin of the idea itself, and of the proper term by which to designate it, is not less completely independent of Philo and of all Alexandrinism.

A pretended feature of the narrative has been alleged as a proof of the influence exerted on our author by the Alexandrine speculations, viz. *Docetism* (the conception according to which the body of Jesus could only have been a mere appearance), which would be a consequence of the opposition established by the philosophy of which we are speaking between mind and matter. Baur, especially, has developed that argument. He takes his stand on vii. 10, where it is said that "Jesus went up to Jerusalem, not openly, but as it were *in secret;*" which, according to him, would signify that He *made Himself invisible;* next, on viii. 59, where it is related that at the moment when the Jews attempted to stone Jesus, *He hid Himself,* and went out of the temple; finally, on the analogous case in x. 39. It is necessary to wish to find at any price a Docetic idea in our work, in order to bring it out of those texts. The expressions, "*in secret,*" "*hid Himself,*" are employed in the same chapter (vii. 4) by the brethren of Jesus in quite a different sense; for when they say: "There is no man that doeth anything *in secret,*" that certainly does not mean, with a body which is not real. The meaning of the passage quoted is very simple. Jesus does not go up to Jerusalem with the caravan, in the midst of which He might be the object of remark, but by unfrequented ways, and without being accompanied by all His disciples. In regard to the two other passages, if Docetism is contained in them, it would also be contained in Luke iv. 30, where we see Jesus escaping in exactly the same way, passing through the midst of the multitude who wished to cast Him down headlong. And besides, how can we admit a Docetic notion of the body of Jesus in a work where the Lord arrives *wearied* at Jacob's well, where He *feels thirst,* where the water and the blood flow from His pierced side; in a work which has for its text, "The Word was *made flesh*"? Baur, it is true, understands that expression in this sense, "that the Logos clothed Himself with a human body," but without on that account entering

into a complete human existence. How can that weakened interpretation of the expression, "was made (became) flesh," σὰρξ γινέσθαι, be defended? And how, in that case, could the *soul* of Jesus *be troubled* in xii. 27? How could Jesus attribute to Himself a life of His own, which He must *give* in order to *find it again?* (xii. 25). Jesus possessed, then, according to the fourth Gospel, a complete human existence, *body, soul,* and *spirit,* 1 Thess. v. 23; and Baur has no right to maintain that the Jesus of John is the Logos invested with a body merely in appearance, and persevering, besides, in His mode of divine existence.

A third feature which it is believed has been discovered in the theology of the fourth Gospel,—this discovery is due to Hilgenfeld,—is a marked sympathy for Gnosticism, such as flourished in the second century in the *school of Valentinus.* Not that the author was exactly a disciple of that school, but he favoured such a tendency; and whilst seeking to purify it, he desired to make it penetrate into the church. The most marked indication of such sympathy would be the *dualism* common to the Valentinian system and to our Gospel, in virtue of which mankind would be originally divided into the children of God or of the light, and the children of the devil or of darkness, and the work of the Saviour would merely be to furnish that contrast with an opportunity of manifesting itself. Weizsäcker shares that idea up to a certain point; he maintains that in our Gospel "the faith of believers is less the effect of their free surrender than that of their election," and that that work establishes an *irreconcilable contrast* between the two halves of the human race. Hilgenfeld even discovers in the passage, viii. 43 and 44, a purely Gnostic idea, that of the creation of the devil by a God of an inferior rank, the Demiurge, the creator of the material world, whom certain sects, such as the Ophites, identified with the God of the Jews. That latter discovery has not met with much success in the learned world, even among the most advanced critics. Scholten positively rejects it. To bring it out of the text in John, Hilgenfeld does not translate: "You are of your father the devil;" but, "Ye are of *the father of the devil,* and the lusts of your father ye will do." If that interpretation were well founded, what would follow from it? First of all, the

Jews would be, not the sons, but the brethren of the devil, since they would have for father the father of the devil; which is opposed to the entire context of the passage, and to the parallel passage in the first Epistle (iii. 10): "In this the children of God are manifest, and *the children of the devil*" (comp. ver. 8); it would then be necessary to apply what follows: "He was a murderer from the beginning . . .; when he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own . . .," not to the devil, but to the father of the devil, a personage quite unknown in the Scriptures. Finally, when John adds: "Because he is a liar," *and* (so Hilgenfeld translates it) "*his father also*," those words, "his father also," must apply to the father of the father of the devil! What a building up of consequences, each more monstrous than the preceding! As if the very simple intention of the passage were not to prove to the Jews that the moral tendency of their actions is that of the devil himself, at once an enemy to the truth and the murderer of man (an allusion to the history of the fall), and consequently in the highest degree hostile to the man who proclaims the truth (vv. 38–40); and that thus it is quite a mistake on their part to claim the title of children of God (vv. 41, 42). If, in the first proposition of ver. 44, the article is wanting before the word "*father*," and is found before the word "*devil*," it is because the meaning is: "Ye are born of *a* spiritual father; and that father is not he whom ye claim, but *the* devil."[1] The moral opposition pointed out in our Gospel between carnal and spiritual men, the children of the devil and the children of God, would only be in harmony with the Gnostic Dualism in so far as it rested on a primordial difference of origin and of essence, and not upon a tendency of the will, subject to all possible reactions of liberty. But such is not the thought of the evangelist. The great moral currents which, according to him, draw men away, draw them, without doubt fatally, so long as they last; but they are susceptible of being transformed under the control of new factors, the influence of which is welcomed by the will.

[1] Hilgenfeld maintains that no reasonable word against his explanation has yet been advanced; we would wish to express the hope that this slight philological observation may produce some impression upon him, should he do us the honour to read it.

And how, in the opposite case, could our Gospel impose upon man the obligation of repentance, of conversion, of being born again, and hold him responsible for not having fulfilled these internal acts?—There is no trace of Gnosticism in the assertion, that so long as a man is carnal, he cannot act otherwise than carnally; provided that it is at the same time admitted that that carnal current may give place in every man to a spiritual current, if he is willing to place himself under the higher influence which will produce it. This way of regarding matters rests on the truest and deepest psychological intuition; it alone cuts short all the superficialities of Pelagianism; it constitutes one of the fundamental premises of Christian thought, and serves as a basis to the idea of regeneration. We find it at the root of the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptics. In the parable of the sower, the quality of the four soils evidently exists prior to the arrival of the sower and to the action of the word; but that does not hinder the word from being able to react on the quality of the soils, that is to say, on the moral tendency which sways man; otherwise, why scatter the seed on those soils which are devoted by fate to sterility? We find precisely the same idea in the fourth Gospel. When Nicodemus comes to Jesus, he is still "*flesh born of flesh*," and unfit in that state for the kingdom of God, iii. 6. But that innate moral tendency is neither inherent in his person nor insuperable by his will. Otherwise, why should Jesus speak to him as He does, and invite him to become, through the baptism of water and of the Spirit, "*spirit born of Spirit*"?[1]

Assuredly, the most instructive passage in this respect is the conclusion of chap. v., where Jesus declares to the Jews that their profound study of the Scriptures is fruitless, "because *they will not* come to Him that they might have life" (vv. 39, 40). That "*will not*" is afterwards brought back to a "*cannot*" (ver. 44: "How can ye believe?"). And finally, how is that "*cannot*" to be explained? By predestination? No; but by two moral dispositions which Jesus thus characterizes: "Ye seek the honour which cometh from men,"

[1] How is it possible to understand that Hilgenfeld can quote those very words (iii. 6): "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; that which is born of the Spirit is spirit," as a proof of the invincibility of the contrast!

and "ye have not the love of God, and of the honour that cometh from Him only." These dispositions create a chasm between them and Jesus, who Himself "seeketh not the honour which cometh from men, but only the honour that cometh from God" (vv. 41–44). But that moral incompatibility between Him and them is by no means insurmountable; otherwise, what would be the use of pointing it out to them? and to what well-grounded reproach could their persistence in that vicious tendency give occasion? The enigma is solved in the concluding words (vv. 46 and 47), where Jesus declares to them that the evil proceeds from their never having seriously placed themselves under the influence of Moses. If they had allowed the spirit of the law to act on their hearts, their natural tendency would have been changed by the work of that divine agent, and the eye of their heart would have been directed to God alone; and now they would find themselves in harmony with Jesus; they *would desire*, and they *would be able* to believe. "*For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me.*" Therefore, what predisposes men to accept, or to reject almost fatally the grace and the revelation which are granted to them, is not a divine decree, excluding the free determination of individuals; it is their faithfulness or unfaithfulness in regard to the grace and revelation previously received. And yet that necessity remains purely moral, and can be overcome either by a return to faithfulness in regard to previous revelations, or by an energetic act of docility towards the new revelation. At any one of the stages of his existence, whatever it may be, let the man yield himself solely to the action of the divine factor which presses on him, the moral tendency which swayed him is instantly changed; and that tendency being changed, the will is set at liberty, and the faith, which was formerly impossible, becomes possible. It is in this way that the two groups of the children of God and the children of the devil, of whom the fourth Gospel speaks, are separated. The same opposition is taught in the Synoptics; for instance, when Jesus says, in His explanation of the parable of the tares: "The good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one" (Matt. xiii. 38). That contrast, to which our four Gospels attribute an entirely moral import,

has been travestied by the Gnostics, who have made of it an insurmountable physical contrast.

Weizsäcker also points out, as a peculiarity of the Johannine theology, what he calls the *hardness* of Jesus in the working out of His miracles. Jesus does not perform them from love, from compassion, as in the Synoptics, but solely that God may be glorified by them. It is not a man, it is only the Logos who can feel things in this way. We shall make two remarks in answer to this observation: 1st. Is there neither compassion for the sisters of Lazarus nor love for Lazarus himself in the act by which Jesus raises that dead man, who from the beginning has been called *His* friend, and whose return to life, He clearly foresees, will become the signal for His own death? And when He says to the nobleman, "Go, thy son liveth," do we not perceive in those words, "*thy son*," a feeling of joyful and tender sympathy for the happiness of that father? 2d. Are we to forget that the glory of God, in the eyes of Jesus, did not consist in external miracles, —that is to say, in the manifestation of power as such,—but in the display of the power of God in the service of His moral perfection, and especially of His goodness? The love of the Father shows the work to the Son, the love of the Son accomplishes it; therein is the glory of God.

When Baur thinks that he can distinguish the God of Paul as a God of righteousness from that of our evangelist as a God of love, he changes a mere shade of distinction into an opposition. Paul shows the transition from the state of sin to that of salvation; and he dwells especially on the relations of the sinner to the divine righteousness; but for all that, he does not forget love: "And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. v. 18). That is the pendant to the words of John: "God hath so loved the world" . . . And, on the other hand, John, who depicts the believer in the full enjoyment of the life in God, above all things brings forward the divine love, although he also well knows how to speak of the wrath of God (iii. 36), and to put into the mouth of Jesus, at the moment when the latter is sacrificing Himself for sinners, that invocation, "O *righteous* Father!" (xvii. 25).

What, in short, are we to think of this antagonism between

two contradictory Christologies, traces of which Weizsäcker, Beyschlag, and many others allege are to be found in our Gospel? Jesus, they say, expresses Himself like a Being in possession of a true human consciousness; no word put into His mouth indicates in Him the idea of a personal existence prior to His appearance here below; whilst the theory of the Logos, expounded by the evangelist in his prologue, teaches His pre-existence in a manner absolutely incompatible with the reality of His humanity. But how are we to explain from this point of view, we shall ask Beyschlag, the words of Jesus to which we have alluded (p. 179), and which seem so evidently to contain the idea of His personal pre-existence? The answer given is, that they refer solely to the *divine idea* of the Christ, which constituted a part of God's eternal plan; and that Jesus, in contemplating His earthly being in the light of that eternal design, was able to express Himself, as He has done in our Gospel, without really attributing to Himself a personal existence prior to His coming into the world. It is sufficient, we think, to read the words in question over again, to be convinced of the over-refinement of that explanation. If it were a question only of the *idea* of the Christ in the divine mind, how could Jesus say: "Before Abraham was, *I AM*"? Was not Abraham also from all eternity in the purposes of God? The designed antithesis of these terms: *was* and *I am*, is a not less certain proof of the true thought of the Lord. That thought is, then, in all points in accordance with the prologue; and Keim is right in setting aside that hypothesis of two contrary theologies, already so improbable in itself, and in establishing a mathematical relation between the ideas of the prologue and the entire contents of the Gospel (p. 124). The fact of the pre-existence, moreover, is not incompatible, as Beyschlag imagines it, with the true humanity of Jesus. We fall into the dilemma which opposes those two facts only because the act which unites them, and forms the transition between the divine state of Jesus and His human existence, the *laying aside* of which St. Paul speaks, Phil. ii. 6, 8 and 2 Cor. viii. 9 (the κένωσις), is not understood. Jesus voluntarily renounced the glorious independence of the divine state, to enter into all the conditions of dependence connected with human existence; and He

realized under the form of that dependence the same filial relation to the Father which He realized in the eternal order under the glorious form of the divine independence; and that in order to initiate us into this relation, and to introduce us into it. Such is the central point of our evangelist's thoughts; he has given expression to them for ever in that incomparable declaration: "The Word was made flesh."

Instead of the anti-Judaic spirit, we find in the fourth Gospel the explicit acknowledgment of the theocratic development, as a preparation for the fact of redemption. Instead of a metaphysical theory of the Logos, we find revealed in it the act of love by which the Logos came down to us, in order to raise us even to Himself. Instead of an inexplicable opposition between two classes of human creatures, proceeding, the one from God, the other from the devil, we find in it the antagonism of two moral conditions, which may succeed each other in the same being, that of fallen humanity delivered over to the power of the flesh, and that of believing humanity, which by regeneration has passed from the dominion of the flesh to that of the spirit.

Harmony of the Gospel with the theocratic past; harmony of the fact of the Incarnation with the order of nature which rests on the mediation of the same Logos; harmony of the coming of Jesus with the deepest aspirations of the human soul which emanate from Him, and which He Himself comes to satisfy: such are the sacred strains which took hold of the ear of the evangelist in his Master's teaching, and which constitute the basis of his theology. We might sum up the latter in the following theses: God possesses in His essence the Being who reunites all the truth which He thinks, all the goodness He desires, all the beauty which He conceives, the living realization of His ideal,—that is, the Son of His bowels, the word of His being.

That Being possesses, as a gift, the divine prerogative of deriving His life only from Himself.

God has created nothing except in concert with Him. He is the luminous basis of all existence.

From that Being flow forth all those intuitions of the good, the beautiful, and the true, which more or less illumine every human soul.

It is He who, announced by John the Baptist, appeared in Jesus Christ, in the dwelling-place which He had prepared for Himself here below.

He entered into the fulness of human existence in order to realize in it in time the filial life which He realized in the eternal order under the divine form.

Those whose soul was opened to the influences of His eternal revelation recognise, in contemplating Him, the sun from whom emanate those divine rays by which their soul was illumined.

Those who resisted His inner light likewise reject His historical appearance in the person of Jesus.

In receiving Him, the former find life, and possess God Himself.

In rejecting Him, the latter separate themselves from God, and pronounce sentence of death on themselves.

The judgment of each is the work of each.

III.

Literary Characteristics.

It now remains for us to consider our Gospel from a literary point of view. Tholuck, in the introduction to his brief commentary, has well brought out the unique character of the evangelist's language. There is nothing analogous to it in the whole of sacred or profane literature. Childlike simplicity and transparent depth, a holy melancholy, and a vivacity not less holy; above all, the sweetness of a pure and gentle love,—such a style can only emanate, says Hase, from a life which rests in God, and in which all opposition between the present and the future, between the divine and the human, has entirely come to an end. Let us endeavour to state in a precise manner the peculiarities of that style characteristic of our author.[1]

1. The vocabulary, in its sum total, is poor. It is, in general, the same expressions which present themselves from

[1] It is impossible to treat this subject with more acuteness and delicacy than Luthardt has done in the introduction to his commentary, 2d ed., 1875. 1st vol. pp. 14–62.

one end to the other: *light* (φῶς), 23 times; *glory, to be glorified* (δόξα, δοξάζεσθαι), 42 times; *life, to live* (ζωή, ζῆν), 52 times; *to witness, testimony* (μαρτυρεῖν, μαρτυρία), 47 times; *to know* (γινώσκειν), 55 times; *world* (κόσμος), 78 times; *to believe* (πιστεύειν), 98 times; *work* (ἔργον), 23 times; *name* (ὄνομα), and *truth* (ἀληθεία), each 25 times; *sign* (σημεῖον), 17 times. Not only is the author not afraid to repeat those words in his writing, but he does so, and in a reiterated manner, in sentences very closely resembling each other. At the first glance, that gives a character of monotony to his style; but only at the first glance. These expressions very soon make amends to the reader for their small number by their intrinsic wealth. They are not purely abstract notions, but powerful spiritual realities, which may be studied under a multitude of aspects. If the author has only a few terms in his vocabulary, those terms may be compared to pieces of gold with which great lords make payment. This feature, moreover, is in keeping with the Eastern mind, which loves to contemplate the infinite, and all that is connected with it. The Old Testament already recognises those profound expressions: *light, darkness, truth, lie, glory, name, life, death.*

2. Certain favourite forms which, without exactly coming into collision with the laws of the Greek language, are nevertheless foreign to that language, and betray a Hebrew turn of thought. Thus, to designate the closest spiritual union, the use of the term *to know;* to indicate moral dependence in regard to another being, the terms *to be in* (εἶναι ἐν), *to dwell in* (μένειν ἐν); to characterize the relation between a spiritual principle and the person in whom it becomes incarnate, the expression "*son*" (*the son of perdition,* υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας); certain forms of purely Hebraic origin; to rejoice with joy (χαρᾷ χαίρειν), for ever (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα); finally, Hebrew words changed into Greek words, as in the formula: Amen, amen (ἀμὴν ἀμήν).

3. The construction is simple; the ideas are rather placed in juxtaposition, than organically fitted in according to the arts of Greek construction. This distinctive feature is especially observable in some striking instances (i. 10, ii. 9, iii. 19, vi. 22–24, viii. 32, xvii. 25), where it would not have been difficult to compose a truly Greek phrase. To this altogether Hebraic form are in like manner connected those frequent

anacolutha, according to which the dominant idea is first of all placed at the beginning, by means of an absolute substantive, then repeated by a pronoun regularly construed; comp. vi. 39, vii. 38, xvii. 2. We know that such instances are still more frequent in the Apocalypse.

4. Out of all the wealth of the Greek particles the author only makes use of "*now*" (δέ), also, although seldom enough, of "*and*" (καί), of "*then*" (οὖν), and of "*as*" (ὡς or καθώς). "*Μέν*," so common in Greek, is almost disused by him. I think it appears only once in the whole work (xix. 24). The "*and*" and the "*then*" replace the conversive *Vau*, which is in some degree the only Hebrew particle. The "*then*" brings out the providential necessity which, in the eyes of the author, unites the facts; the "*and*" is often employed in those cases where the particle of opposition, "*but*," might be expected; for instance: "And the light shineth in darkness, *and* the darkness comprehended it not" (i. 5); or else: "But now have they both seen *and* hated both me and my Father" (xv. 24); "We speak that we do know, *and* ye receive not our witness" (iii. 11). Luthardt acutely observes that such a form emanates from a mind which has overcome the astonishment or indignation produced by that unforeseen result, and which henceforth contemplates it with the calmness of indifference, or of a grief without bitterness. The use of the particle "*as*" (comp. for instance, chap. xvii.) is inspired by the necessity of drawing out the analogies; this is one of the most characteristic features which created that style. That tendency goes even so far as to identify the earthly symbols of divine things with the latter: "I am the true vine;" "I am the good shepherd." The reality is not, in the eyes of him who thus writes, the earthly phenomenon, but the divine invisible fact, of which the sensible phenomenon is only the copy.

The author likewise very frequently employs the conjunction "*in order that*" (ἵνα) in a weakened sense, and one which would seem to reduce it to the mere idea of effect: "*so that*;" but even here a feature of his turn of mind reveals itself: the teleological tendency, the necessity of apprehending the divine *aim*; it is the spirit of all historiography. That which, in the eyes of men, seems only an historical result, appears, from a loftier point of view, as the realization of the purpose of God.

5. A strange contrast has been observed in the narrative forms. On the one hand, something slow, diffuse, for instance, that form so frequent in the dialogues: "He answered and said;" or the repetition of proper names, John, Jesus, in those places where a Greek writer would have employed the pronoun (which also belongs to the Oriental stamp of style; Winer, *Grammar*, sec. 65 [E. T. p. 752 ff.]); or, again, that dragging construction, in virtue of which, at the conclusion of a statement, a participle with its dependent words is unexpectedly added, with the view of throwing a clearer light on the fact mentioned (comp. i. 12, iii. 13, v. 18, vi. 71, vii. 50); or, finally, instead of the finite verb, the heavier form of the verb *to be*, with the participle,—a form for which in certain cases there may be a reason, as in classic writers, but which is too often employed here not to be, as Thiersch observes, a reproduction of the form common in Aramaic; and on the other hand, the frequent appearance of short and abrupt propositions, which break up the sentence, and are thrown into it without connection: "Now Barabbas was a robber" (xviii. 40); "And it was night" (xiii. 30); "It was the tenth hour" (i. 40); "And on the same day was the Sabbath" (v. 9); "Now Jesus loved Martha and her sister" (xi. 5); "Jesus wept" (xi. 35). Those brief propositions are like jets of internal fire bursting forth; they serve to break the serenity of the view. Here is found the indication of the passionate feeling peculiar to the Semite; an exciting recollection is enough to drag him all at once from the calm majesty with which he usually thinks fit to surround himself.

6. In regard to the way in which the ideas connect themselves, we remark three characteristic features: Either, as we have seen, a brief, summary word is laid down as a centre, and around it is found a series of cycles, exhausting, down to its most concrete applications, the primary idea. Or else it is a whole series of propositions without external connection, as in the first twenty verses of chap. xv.; it seems as if each thought had all its weight in itself, and deserved to be studied apart. Or else, finally, a bond of an entirely peculiar nature is formed by the repetition, in the following proposition, of one of the principal words of the preceding,—for instance, x. 11, xiii. 20, xvii. 2, 3, 9, 11, 15, 16, and, above all, i. 1–5. Each pro-

position is like a link connected with the preceding link in such a way as to form an ascending chain. The two first forms are repugnant to the Greek genius, the third is borrowed from the Old Testament (Ps. cxxi. and Gen. i. 1 ff.).

7. We have already remarked on the style as characterized by imagery; let us here add its profoundly symbolical character; thus the expressions *to draw, to teach,* in speaking of God; *to see, to hear,* in speaking of the relation of Christ to the invisible world; *to be hungry, thirsty,* in a spiritual sense. Such is ever the Oriental and specially the Hebraic stamp.

8. We shall merely cite two features more: the *parallelism* of the propositions, which is known to be the distinctive sign of the poetical style among the Hebrews, and the *refrain,* which is in like manner employed by them. On all the occasions when the feeling of him who speaks is elevated, or his soul greatly moved, by the contemplation of a lofty truth, to which he is bearing witness, those two forms appear. For the parallelism, comp. iii. 11, v. 37, vi. 35, 55, 56, xii. 41, 45, xiii. 16, xv. 20, xvi. 20; for the refrain, iii. 15, 16, vi. 39, 40, 44; comp. Gen. i.: "And the evening," etc.; Amos i. and ii.; and elsewhere, especially in the Psalms.

What judgment, then, are we to pass on the style and literary character of this work? On the one hand, M. Renan tells us: "That style contains nothing that is Hebraic, Jewish, or Talmudic." And he is right, if by style we understand merely the forms which are altogether external to the language. There is not to be found in the fourth Gospel, as in certain parts of Luke (the two first chapters, from the 4th verse), Hebraisms properly so called, imported just as they are into the Greek text, the conversive *Vau,* for example, nor, as in the translation of the LXX., Hebrew terms of expression clumsily Hellenized. On the other hand, a scholar, who has not less profoundly studied the spirit of the Semitic languages, Ewald, thus expresses himself: "No language can be, in respect of the spirit and breath which animates it, more purely Hebraic than that of our author." And he is equally right, if we consider the internal qualities of the style; the whole of our preceding study has sufficiently demonstrated this.

In John's language, the clothing alone is Greek, the body is Hebrew; or, as Luthardt says, there is a Hebrew soul in

the Greek language of the evangelist. Keim has devoted to the style of the fourth Gospel a beautiful page, a few sentences of which we shall here quote. He sees in it "the ease and flexibility of the purest Hellenism adapted to the Hebrew mode of expression, with all its candour, simplicity, profusion of imagery, and sometimes also its awkwardness. No research, no pathos: all in it is simple and flowing as in life; but everywhere, at the same time, acuteness, variety, progress,—features scarcely indicated, which form themselves into a picture in the mind of the reflective reader. Everywhere are mysteries which surround you and are on the watch for you; signs and symbols which could not be taken literally, if the author had not affirmed their reality; accidents and minute details, which are found to be, all at once, full of meaning; cordiality, calmness, harmony; in the midst of struggles, grief, zeal, anger, irony; finally, at the end, at the farewell meal, on the cross, and in the resurrection, peace, victory, greatness."

From this study of Historiographic, Theological, and Literary characteristics of our Gospel, it is time to pass to that of its origin. The labour to which we have just devoted ourselves has supplied us with a considerable portion of the information which was necessary to decide that last and important question.

BOOK THIRD.

THE ORIGIN OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

INDICATIONS of two kinds furnish us with the means of scientifically determining the situation to which the composition of our Gospel is due. These are, first of all, those which are comprised in the book itself, and the greater part of which we have already collected; in the second place, they are the *external* data, the facts of ecclesiastical history, whether we understand by that the *quotations* from our Gospel in the writings of the second century, or the *accounts* which the Fathers give us of the origin of that work; or, finally, the *ecclesiastical circumstances* with which we can connect its composition.

The perfect harmony among those different kinds of data, if it should show itself to be such, will determine the highest possible degree of scientific certainty. We cannot go further, and say that belief on the part of the reader will be its necessary result. There is in faith, as Jesus has made us understand, a moral factor, an element of freedom, independent of scientific labour, so that assent to the results of the latter is never forced.

We shall investigate: 1st. The *time* of the composition of the fourth Gospel; 2d. The *author* to whom that work must be ascribed; 3d. The *place* where it was published; 4th. Finally, the *aim* which presided over its composition.

CHAPTER I.

THE TIME OF THE COMPOSITION.

Apart from the received opinion, which, ascribing our Gospel to John, places its composition before the end of the first century, modern criticism has found in the second century three dates and three chief situations, which have seemed to it fitted to explain the origin of such a work. The date which is the farthest removed from current opinion is that which has been chosen by Baur, the head of the Tübingen School, which at the present day exclusively claims for itself the name of *critical school.* Our Gospel, according to it, must have been composed in Asia Minor or in Egypt, shortly before the year 170.

The second principal date is that which is generally adopted at the present day by the disciples of Baur, between 130 and 155. Thus Volkmar, 155; Zeller (since 1853) and Scholten (since 1867), 150; Hilgenfeld (in his *Introduction,* 1875), 130–140; Keim (since 1875), 130. That is a retrogression of about a quarter of a century from the preceding date.

Finally, several writers have taken a new and retrograde step, about a quarter of a century farther. Keim, in his great work (*History of Jesus,* 1867), fixes the epoch from 100 to 120 (p. 146), more precisely, from 110 to 115 (p. 155). Holtzmann considers our Gospel as contemporaneous with the Epistle of Barnabas, which certainly dates from the beginning of the second century. Bretschneider said: at the *beginning* (or the *middle*) of the second century. MM. Nicolas, Renan, Weizsäcker, and others, in attributing it to one of the members of the school of Ephesus, seem also to admit that third date.

Things being in such a condition, we shall consider, by means of these two classes of data indicated above, these three situations proposed; and, if facts do not permit us to pronounce them worthy of being received, we shall go on to the traditional opinion, which we shall cause to pass in its turn through the crucible of criticism.

I.

160–170.—Baur.

At the first glance, nothing of importance for our Gospel results from that declaration of Eusebius, in the first part of the fourth century (*H. E.* iii. 24), "that the Gospel according to John, known in all churches which are under heaven, should be admitted into the first rank." Nevertheless, if we take into account the twofold fact, that Eusebius possessed a perfect knowledge of the literature of the preceding centuries (which was quite within his reach in the libraries of Pamphilus at Cæsarea, and of Alexander at Jerusalem), and that he states with precision and frankness the slightest vacillations of opinion in regard to the biblical books,—for instance, the omission of any quotation from the Epistle to the Hebrews in the great work of Irenæus,—it seems impossible that, if even in 160 or 170 he had found no trace of the work attributed to John, he should not have been struck with that colossal blank in the tradition, or that he could have represented that writing as *universally recognised.* We could only explain his silence on that singular fact as a wilful reticence,—conduct which would present a contrast to his established good faith.

We may say as much in regard to the testimony of Origen (about 220). He includes our Gospel in the number of the four "which alone are received without dispute in the church of God which is under heaven" (in Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 25). He constantly speaks of it as a work in regard to which he knows neither doubt nor cause for doubt. And yet numerous apocryphal gospels were already in circulation in his time, and the church was on her guard. Could so universal and absolute a belief in the apostolic authority of our Gospel have been possible, if that book had only made its appearance about 170, and if no trace had demonstrated its existence before that epoch? Clement of Alexandria, the master of Origen, declares that he drew his information from the presbyters, the series of whom goes back as far as the time of the apostles (*ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνέκαθεν πρεσβυτέρων*), especially from Pantænus, who had been a missionary in India, and who died in 189. Sup-

posing that our Gospel had suddenly appeared, about 170, as a work till then unknown to all those presbyters, could Clement have been able to transmit, as receiving it from themselves, the following account of the origin of that Gospel: "John received the three first Gospels, and observing that they comprised the external facts in the life of the Lord, he, at the instance of eminent men in the church, wrote a spiritual Gospel"? (in Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 14). Moreover, Clement himself opposes our four canonical Gospels to the other evangelical writings which were in circulation, to the Gospel of the Egyptians, for instance, saying: "We have not those words in the four Gospels which have been translated to us."[1] What would be the meaning of the opposition thus established between the apocryphal gospels, composed during the course of the second century, and a gospel which could only have been from twenty to twenty-five years in existence, and which would have been younger than several amongst those which Clement thus placed in the second rank?

Tertullian, born about 160 (perhaps even about 150), brings forward numerous quotations from our Gospel. For that purpose he makes use of a Latin translation, which seems to be much older than his own writings, since it had only won the official sanction which it enjoyed in the province of Africa after a struggle with other translations. That authority was already such, that even where he does not agree with it, Tertullian, as Rönsch has shown, does not feel himself at liberty to deviate from it.[2] *In usu est nostrorum*, he likewise says of that translation (*Adv. Prax.*).[3] In it the writings of the New Testament appear to have been already divided into certain groups: the *instrumentum Evangelicum*, or the body of the four Gospels; and the *instrumenta Apostolica*, including: 1st, the instrument (or brief) of the Acts; 2d, that of Paul; 3d, that of John (Apocalypse and 1st John); 4th, a group of Antilegomena (1st Peter, Hebrews, an Epistle which Tertullian, as is known, attributes to Barnabas and Jude).

[1] *Strom.* iii. p. 465: ἐν τοῖς παραδιδομένοις ἡμῖν τέτρασιν εὐαγγελίοις.

[2] Rönsch, *Das Sprachidiom der unchristlichen Itala und der katholischen Vulgata*, 1869, pp. 2–4.

[3] There was even in existence an older Latin translation which, in the time of Tertullian, had become obsolete, and of which he said: *In usum exiit* (*de Monogam.* ii.).

And what succeeds in impressing a canonical character on that translation is, that in it the New Testament is preceded by the Old.[1] Our Gospel, already translated into Latin, then occupied, between 190 and 210, a place in a canonical collection belonging to the province of Africa. And yet the original had only made its appearance on the stage of the church about twenty or thirty years previously! Who could ever have admitted any such history?

At the opposite extremity of the church, we at the same period meet with a very similar phenomenon. The Syriac translation of the Old and New Testaments, named *Peshito*, belongs to the close of the second century. It seems even proved now-a-days that it had succeeded a still older Syriac translation.[2] Our Gospel formed a portion of this. Consequently, at the opposite extremities of the church, that work, translated into two new languages, had its place marked out in two collections, which enjoyed official authority; and yet it had only existed in the original about twenty years!

About 190, our Gospel is found in the hands of Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, the city in which John must have ended his life. Indeed, in an official letter which that bishop addressed to Victor in the name of all his colleagues in Asia (Eusebius, *H. E.* iii. 31), he calls St. John: "He who rested on the bosom of the Lord" (Ἰωάνν. ὁ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ κυρίου ἀναπεσών), so evident an allusion to John xiii. 25, that Hilgenfeld, who at first thought that it could be disputed, has ended by conceding it.[3]

Irenæus must have written his great work between 180 and 185. That was, then, from ten to fifteen years after the alleged date of the appearance of our Gospel. In it he quotes from that work more than sixty times, with the entire conviction of its apostolic origin. He assigns it a place in "the Gospel with the four forms" (τετράμορφον εὐαγγέλιον), which already presents itself to his mind as an indivisible unity. And he who thus deals with it is an emigrant from Asia Minor, who in his youth, at Smyrna, was a hearer of Poly-

[1] Rönsch, *Das Neue Testament Tertullians*, 1871.

[2] Cureton has published several fragments of the latter (*Remains of a very Ancient Recension*, etc., London 1858).

[3] *Die Evangelien*, 1854, p. 345.

carp, the disciple of St. John, a man who abides by tradition, and who incessantly opposes it to the Gnostics, those heretics in whose interest that Gospel is said to have been forged! Is there not here a sufficient amount of collected improbabilities?

To Irenæus is usually ascribed the redaction of the *letter* addressed in 177 by *the churches of Vienne and Lyons* to those of Asia and Phrygia for the purpose of relating to them the persecution to which they had recently been subjected under Marcus Aurelius. In this letter, which Eusebius has preserved to us (*H. E.* v. 1), are found two passages evidently borrowed from our Gospel: "Having the Paraclete within him," is said of one of the martyrs; and in another passage: "Thus were fulfilled the words spoken by our Lord, that 'the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service' (comp. John xiv. 26 and xvi. 2)." Scholten himself admits that the formula: "the words spoken by the Lord," here employed (*τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν εἰρημένον*), proves the application of the idea of "Holy Scripture" to the book quoted. Thus, in Gaul, seven years after the date assigned to it by Baur, our Gospel would have been quoted as a canonical writing, and forming a portion of the biblical collection.

About 170, the Bishop of Antioch, Theophilus, addressed to his heathen friend Autolycus an apology for Christianity, in which he quotes the commencement of John's prologue, prefacing that quotation by these words: "That is what we learn from the *sacred writings*, and from all men animated by the Spirit, amongst whom John says" (*Ad Autol.* ii. 22). The adversaries of the authenticity generally dwell upon the circumstance, that this is the first time that the author of our Gospel is designated by name by an ecclesiastical writer. But, as Luthardt here observes, it should be recollected that such a circumstance is purely accidental. Theophilus, doubtless, would not, any more than the other writers who preceded him, have mentioned the name of John, if he had not been addressing a man who had no acquaintance with the writings received in the church. Irenæus, the contemporary of Theophilus, is the first writer who is found designating St. Paul as the author of the Epistle to the Romans. Must we conclude from that that the conviction of the apostolic origin of that Epistle was only then in course of formation? Theophilus,

besides, composed a *Harmony of the Gospels.* Jerome, who was acquainted with that work, describes it as "reuniting in one single writing the words of the four Gospels."[1] And the Gospel which was thus blended into one with the Synoptics, long ago admitted and publicly read, could only be ten years old! From 160 to 180 the Bishop Apollinaris was living at Hierapolis. He controverted, about 170, in a special treatise, the opinion of those who, on the authority of Matthew's Gospel, celebrated the Christian Passover on the evening of the 14th Nisan, at the same time that the Jews ate the Paschal feast, as if Jesus had eaten the Passover on that evening with His disciples, and had not died till the next day, the 15th Nisan. To that point of view Apollinaris replies, "that it is in contradiction with the Law, and that (if it were well founded) the Gospels would contradict each other."[2] What is the meaning of these two reasons? The first, that conformably to the Law, Jesus, the true Paschal Lamb, ought to die on the 14th, the day when the lamb was sacrificed, and not on the 15th; the second, that if that latter sense were really that of Matthew's narrative, that Gospel would contradict another, which places the death of Jesus on the 14th. Now that other Gospel can only be that of John. This latter Gospel, then, was in existence at that epoch; it existed even as a recognised authority, since in the eyes of Apollinaris, as well as in those of his opponents, its testimony possessed a value equal, at least, to that of Matthew himself. Apollinaris wrote thus about 170, at the very time when, according to Baur, the fourth Gospel was put in circulation! We can understand the efforts which Baur has made to twist that passage from its natural meaning. His own school itself has, almost unanimously, condemned him on that point.

That same Father, moreover, calls Jesus, "He whose blessed side was pierced, and who poured forth from His side water and blood, the Word and the Spirit" (*Chron. Pasch.* p. 14). The allusion to John's narrative in that passage admits of no doubt.

[1] *De viris illustr.* c. 25: *Quatuor evangeliorum in unum opus dicta compingens.*

[2] *Chron. Paschale,* ed. Dindorf, i. p. 14: ὅθεν ἀσύμφωνός τι νόμῳ ἡ νόησις αὐτῶν καὶ στασιάζειν δεχεῖ κατ' αὐτοὺς τὰ εὐαγγέλια.

We still possess some passages of a work published in 178 (according to the date fixed by Keim) by the heathen philosopher Celsus. That work, the title of which was, *The True Discourse* (ὁ ἀληθὴς λόγος), was refuted by Origen. Celsus is the first known writer who opposed Christianity. He wished, he said, "to slay the Christians with their own sword,"—that is to say, to refute Christianity by the writings of the disciples of Jesus themselves. He frequently makes use of the fourth Gospel. He recalls the passage in John ii. 18, where the Jews in the temple asked Jesus to prove, by some sign, that He was the Son of God. He ironically compares the water and the blood, issuing from the body of Jesus on the cross, "to the sacred blood which flowed from the body of the gods." He sees a contradiction between our Gospels, from the fact that, according to some (Luke and John), two angels appeared at the sepulchre; according to others (Matthew and Mark), only one. Zeller has made an effort to deny that all those features were borrowed from our canonical Gospels. At the present time, Volkmar admits the quotations. But he claims to avoid the consequences of that fact by an expedient of another kind. According to his view, it would follow from a passage of Origen that Celsus was a contemporary of that Father;[1] which would take away all value from those quotations, since no one doubts that the fourth Gospel was universally known and received in the church in the time of Origen. But Tischendorf has demonstrated to Volkmar that he had entirely misrepresented the meaning of the words of Origen, on which he had based that assertion;[2] and he has directed his attention to a passage where that Father calls Celsus "a man already dead, and that long since" (ἤδη καὶ πάλαι νεκροῦ). No subterfuge, then, allows us to deny that,

[1] *Ursprung unserer Evangelien*, p. 80.

[2] Volkmar says: "Has not Origen declared at the end of his work that Celsus announced that he would publish yet another work, and that there was reason to wait to see if he *would fulfil* his intention?" Now, here is the true text of Origen, restored by Tischendorf: "Celsus promised that he would publish yet another work after the present one. If he has not done so, in spite of his promise, it will be sufficient to have replied to him in these eight books. If he has fulfilled his project, endeavour to procure that book and send it to me, in order that I may reply to it also" (*Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst*, p. 74). How is it possible to draw from the true text the inference which Volkmar has endeavoured to deduce from his falsified text?

eight years after 170, the heathen philosopher Celsus, in harmony with the whole church, made use of the Johannine narrative as the composition of a disciple of Jesus.

In 176, Athenagoras addressed an apology to the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, in which he takes his standpoint on the doctrine of the Logos. "The Son of God," he says, "is the Word of the Father. By Him were all things made." Volkmar admits the reality of the quotations (p. 34).

The famous so-called FRAGMENT of MURATORI is placed between 170 and 180. It is a kind of treatise on the sacred writings used in a church in Italy or Africa. After the Gospel of Luke, indicated as the third, mention is made of that of John, respecting the origin and tendency of which the author gives some details. Hilgenfeld alleges that he finds in these details the proof that our Gospel was not admitted in such a way that its apostolic origin has not still to be demonstrated. But it is impossible for us, as well as for many others, to discover the slightest polemical intention in the terms of which the author makes use. He there names John exactly as he names Luke or Paul, so as to leave the reader under the impression that he is speaking of things universally acknowledged. If, as that is indisputable, this writing, of a semi-official character, emanated either from a church in Africa or from the church of Rome, between 170 and 180, we must thence conclude that our Gospel was publicly read at that time in the churches of the West. How could such a fact be possible only some years after its composition at Ephesus or Alexandria about 170?

In 170 there burst forth at Laodicea a violent dispute in reference to the feast of the Passover, and, as Eusebius relates, at the very time of that solemnity. Melito, bishop of Sardis, one of the principal teachers of his time, wrote a treatise on that subject. That work is lost, as well as all the others by the same author. But a fragment, published by Otto,[1] contains an indubitable allusion to our fourth Gospel: "Jesus being, at the same time, perfect God and man, has proved His divinity by His miracles *in the three years which followed His baptism* (ἐν τῇ τριετίᾳ τῇ μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα), and His humanity during the thirty years which preceded it."

[1] *Corpus apologet.*, book ix.

The indication of the three years, as the duration of the ministry of Jesus, could only proceed from the Johannine narrative.

In like manner, about 170, Tatian, soon after the death of his master Justin (in 166), wrote his *Discourse to the Greeks* (λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας), and another work, the title of which Eusebius has preserved to us, *The Diatessaron* (τὸ διατεσσάρων), or, *Harmony of the Four*, comprising, according to the account of that Father, a combination of the evangelical narratives. Eusebius does not indicate the names of the Gospels thus blended together, as it were, into a single narrative. Much discussion has taken place on that matter. Without entering upon all the questions which have been raised on that subject, the following are the points which seem to us unquestionable: 1st. Our fourth Gospel must have been included in the number of these four, for Tatian makes use of it by preference in his *Discourse addressed to the Greeks*. "Follow," he says to them, "the only God by whom all things were made, and nothing was made without Him." Elsewhere he says, "God is a Spirit." Then again, "This, then, is what is said (τοῦτό ἐστιν ἄρα τὸ εἰρημένον): 'The darkness did not apprehend the light.'" The reality of these quotations has been acknowledged by Baur. 2d. The number "four" scarcely permits us to think of any except our four Gospels, which alone have been constantly and universally recognised in the church (the τετράμορφον εὐαγγέλιον of Irenæus and Theophilus). 3d. Theodoret relates (*Hæret. Fabulæ*, i. 20), in the fifth century, that he had found in his diocese 200 copies of Tatian's work; but that he had discovered in that work serious omissions, as that of the Genealogies, as well as all that related to the relation of Jesus to David as his son (it is known that Tatian was a Docetic and an Encratite[1]). "I introduced, then, instead of it," he says, "*the Gospels of the Four Evangelists* (τὰ τῶν τεττάρων εὐαγγελιστῶν ἀντεισήγαγον εὐαγγέλια)." Theodoret means to say that he substituted for that incomplete mixture of the four, drawn out by Tatian, the four writings of the evangelists themselves, as four distinct books, such as we find them in the Canon. That way of acting shows us that the four writings combined by Tatian were none other than our Gospels; and the work of Tatian proves,

[1] Denying the reality of the body of Christ, and condemning marriage.

as Luthardt says, how firmly the authority of those writings was even then established, since already they formed the subject of a literary activity. Now it was about 170 that that took place.

Again, in 1850, Hilgenfeld[1] maintained that the fourth Gospel was not quoted in the *Clementine Homilies*. It is in vain that the following words, which we read in that composition, are urged against him: "Such is the reason why the true prophet has himself said: I am the door of life: he who enters by me enters into life;" and again, "My sheep hear my voice" (*Hom. Clem.* iii. 52. Comp. John x. 3, 9, 27). Scholten, on his side, replies that those words were borrowed by the author of the *Homilies* either from tradition or some document which is now lost. But in 1853 Dressel discovered, in a manuscript in the Vatican, the conclusion of that book, which was hitherto wanting, and in the 19th homily (chap. 22) is found an indisputable allusion to the history of the man who was born blind (John ix.). "It is for this reason also that our Lord replied to those who questioned Him, and who asked Him: Who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind? Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents; but that by him the power of God should be made manifest, curing the faults of ignorance." It was very necessary that he should give in. Hilgenfeld now says in his *Introduction* (p. 734): "John's Gospel is made use of without scruple, even by the opponents of the divinity of Christ, such as the pseudo-Clement, the author of the *Clementines*." Volkmar alone still holds out. Our Gospel, he alleges, is not an authority with the unknown author of the *Clementines*, for he permits himself to modify the text of it. It is merely, in his eyes, a new and interesting book, which he takes pleasure in quoting.—And nevertheless that book, according to the Tübingen hypothesis, was destined to radically extirpate Judæo-Christianity, which was precisely the point of view defended by the author of the *Clementines*. What a contradiction! As to the inaccuracy of the quotations, every one knows that the sacred writings are always freely quoted in the second century, even by the orthodox; how much more by heretics! The composition of the *Homilies* is generally placed at the present day, and

[1] *Kritische Untersuchungen über das Evang. Justins*, p. 388.

formerly was so by Volkmar himself, about the year 160,[1]—that is to say, ten years *before* the date which Baur assigns to the composition of our Gospel!

The Gnostic Valentinus, whose arrival at Rome Eusebius places in the time of Bishop Hyginus,—that is to say, between 135 and 139,—had four well-known disciples, Ptolemæus, Heracleon, Marcus, and Theodotus. The two first and the last made use of John's Gospel. In the fragments of Theodotus, which have been preserved to us in the works of Clement of Alexandria, are found seventy-eight quotations from the New Testament, amongst which are twenty-six from the fourth Gospel.[2] In the fragments of Ptolemæus, which Irenæus has transmitted to us, is found that allusion, which admits of little doubt, to John xii. 27: "Then Jesus said, And what shall I say? I know not (ἐν τῷ εἰρηκέναι. καὶ τί εἴπω; οὐκ οἶδα)." Irenæus further relates that Ptolemæus made a weapon of that fact; that the Apostle John himself taught the existence of the first ogdoad, in speaking of the ἀρχή, whom he calls the Son, the only One, and God (μονογένης καὶ Θεός; Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* i. 8. 5). Epiphanius (*Hær.* xxxiii.) has preserved to us a letter from Ptolemæus to Flora, in which he quotes John i. 3 in these words: "The apostle declares that the creation of the world belongs to the Saviour, seeing that all things were made by Him, and that without Him was not anything made." In one of these passages Ptolemæus then quotes our Gospel as that of *John*, in the other as that of *the apostle*.

Finally, the most important fact is the complete commentary on John's Gospel which Heracleon composed, and which Origen refuted. At what date did Heracleon write such a book? That author is generally placed in the middle of the second century; for Origen calls him a "familiar acquaintance (γνώριμος) of Valentinus." Tischendorf on that account assigns to him a date from 150 to 160. Volkmar utters loud cries, exclaiming, "Eh, great God! if between 125 and 155 a commentary was composed on John's Gospel, such as that of which Origen has preserved considerable extracts,

[1] Keim, vol. i. p. 137: "There does not exist at the present time any sufficient reason for carrying down that writing to a date subsequent to 160."

[2] Hofstede de Groot, *Basilides*, p. 102.

what yet remains to be discussed! It is very certain that it is all over with the critical thesis of the composition of the fourth Gospel in the middle of the second century."[1] But not so! According to Volkmar, Heracleon could only have lived at a much later time. He, as well as Celsus, must have been a contemporary of Origen, and could only have commented on the Johannine Gospel about the year 200. And the proof of such an assertion? It is, that Irenæus did not yet know Heracleon,—a circumstance which Tischendorf would certainly have known if he had not been an *ignoramus!* As to the term "γνώριμος" employed by Origen, it must be taken simply in the sense of *disciple.* Tischendorf had no difficulty in putting to shame the man who allowed himself to treat him in that fashion. After the example of Lipsius, who in his work on the *Criticism of the Sources of Epiphanius* had said: "Heracleon, whom Irenæus does not name," Volkmar had allowed himself to be deceived by an omission in the index of the editions.[2] Tischendorf reminded these literati of that passage of Irenæus: "And all the other æons of Ptolemæus *and Heracleon.*"[3] Heracleon, then, really lived before Irenæus, and his writings had already been for a certain time in circulation when the latter wrote his great work about 180. And amongst these already published writings of Heracleon was found a commentary on the fourth Gospel! Now, in order that a sacred writing should become the text of a commentary, it is absolutely necessary that it should have for a long time played an important part in the church, and have there possessed an apostolic authority.[4] The contingency regarded as impossible by Volkmar is then indeed a reality; and according to the disciple of Baur himself, it is all over with the hypothesis of the master!

We have now reached the end of that long array of wit-

[1] *Ursprung unserer Evang.* p. 22.

[2] Cf. Massuet, and even of Stieren.

[3] *Adv. Hær.* ii. 4. Comp. Tischendorf, *Wann wurden unsere Evang. verfasst,* p. ix.

[4] Lipsius has objected in Hilgenfeld's journal, that the work of Heracleon, quoted by Irenæus, might be his commentary on Luke, and not his commentary on John. The expression, *the æons of Heracleon,* is not favourable to such a supposition, since the Valentinian theory of the æons was especially connected with the fourth Gospel.

nesses. We have still to beg the reader to consider that these witnesses belong to the most opposite tendencies: first of all, to the orthodox church; then, to Gnostic Docetism; finally, to the most intense Jewish-Christianity. Amongst these witnesses is found even a heathen. That fact proves at once the very remote antiquity of the Johannine writing, and the universal authority which it already possessed amongst all ecclesiastical parties soon after the middle of the second century. Irenæus mentions, it is true, as being opposed to our Gospel, a sect originating in Asia Minor, which extended as far as Italy. This is probably the same to which Epiphanius afterwards gives the name of ALOGI (ἄλογοι, who reject the Logos). Hilgenfeld urges this fact to prove that the authority of the fourth Gospel was not yet so firmly established as is generally imagined. But in reality this fact proves quite the contrary. Those sectaries were the avowed adversaries of the Montanist fanaticism; they had an abhorrence of the pretended prophets and prophetesses of whom that sect boasted; and through hatred of false inspiration, they rejected in the gross both the Apocalypse with its revelations, and the fourth Gospel with its promise of the Paraclete. Therefore Irenæus compares them to those who, through fear of hypocrites, relinquish brotherly communion (*Adv. Hær.* iii. 11. 9). And to whom, then, did they themselves attribute these two writings? To Cerinthus, the contemporary of John, and his opponent at Ephesus. Can a more striking proof be found of the characteristic of great antiquity which all without exception recognise in these writings? Even those whom dogmatic reasons prevented from attributing them to John could not refuse to date them from the time of John, and from the place where John had lived!

We need not then be surprised that in the end Baur alone has remained faithful to the position which he had chosen, and that the whole school has begun to beat a retreat, in order to seek another which is easier to defend. Before following his disciples in that retrograde movement, we have still to examine the internal reasons alleged by the master in favour of the date fixed by him.

What was it, then, which induced Baur to place the composition of the fourth Gospel at so advanced a period of the

second century, and thus to create for himself the insurmountable chronological difficulties which we have just demonstrated? It was of importance for him to place the composition of that writing in connection with two circumstances which characterize that epoch: the Easter controversy, and the foundation of the Catholic Church. That relation was, in fact, one of the principal points of support of his polemic against the authenticity of our Gospel. That work, in his opinion, put an end to the long struggle between Jewish Christianity and Paulinism, and thereby gave the signal for the foundation of the Catholic Church.[1] And in the Easter controversy it caused the balance to lean in favour of Rome.[2]

As to the first of these two points, it is hard to believe that that alleged treaty of peace, which granted everything to one of those parties, that of Paul, by even going beyond spiritual Paulinism, could have had the *mediating* influence which is ascribed to it. As to the Easter controversy, we shall speak of it here only from the point of view which is before us, the date of the Johannine Gospel. Eusebius, according to Irenæus, relates that, in the time of Anicetus (155 to 166), Polycarp came to Rome, and that they conversed about a difference relating to the Passover. The churches of Asia Minor celebrated the Holy Supper of the Passover on the evening of the 14th Nisan, after having fasted that whole day, whatever the day of the week might be on which that date fell. That was the very evening on which, as is well known, the Jews kept the Paschal feast. The churches of the West and the greater part of those of the East, on the contrary, celebrated the Paschal communion on the morning of the following Sunday, after having fasted during the preceding days. The selection of the day was evidently determined by the recollection of the Resurrection. That difference of rite might involve practical consequences, offensive to the sentiment of Christian unity.

Baur, making the Asiatic rite to depend on the date of the last meal of Christ, and on the institution of the Holy Supper in the Synoptics on the evening of the 14th Nisan (the moment of the Paschal feast amongst the Jews), maintained that the Johannine narrative was so drawn up as to oppose at once the

[1] *Das Christenth. u. die christl. Kirche der drei ersten Jahrh.*, pp. 172, 173.
[2] *Ibid.* pp. 156–170.

Synoptic account, and the Asiatic rite which flowed from it. The fourth Gospel, indeed, in placing the death of Christ on the 14th (John xiii. 1, xviii. 28), and His last supper on the evening of the 13th, removes from that meal everything of a Paschal character, and makes of it an ordinary repast (comp. xiii. 2, "a meal having taken place"). Then, the institution of the Holy Supper having taken place on the evening of the 13th, and not on the evening of the 14th, the Asiatic rite has no longer any foundation, and Rome has conquered.

What answer can we make to such an explanation? Is it not too ingenious to be true? Does it not contrast, by its far-fetched character, with the simplicity of John's account? Have we not clearly demonstrated, that if there is a contradiction between the two evangelical accounts, that of John unhesitatingly deserves the preference, and that in virtue even of the Synoptic narrative? If the author of the fourth Gospel allowed himself arbitrarily to alter history in the interest of the Western rite, would he not understand that the consequence of such an alteration was to transfer the celebration of the Christian Passover to the 13th, but by no means to defer it till the Sabbath morning, according to the Roman ritual? And with the same unlimited liberty of which he made use, must he not have invented some new circumstance, fitted to be a more positive justification of that ritual? Moreover, can it be admitted that, in celebrating the Holy Supper on the evening of the 14th, the churches of Asia really entertained the idea of celebrating the moment of the *institution* of that ceremony? Does that sacred feast not refer to something greater than even the institution of such a feast? Is not the object of that ceremony the redemption accomplished by the death of Christ? And if that great event was celebrated in Asia on the evening of the 14th, was it not in remembrance of the day of that death itself, or at least with the thought of connecting it with the date of the Israelitish Paschal feast, and of the deliverance from Egypt,—types of the Christian redemption?

The Asiatic rite ought not, then, to be placed in any chronological connection with the day of Christ's last supper; and if it is in connection with that of His death, that fact appears as evidence in favour of the Johannine narrative, since it is it alone

which fixes the death of Christ on the 14th. We have to ask, besides, what Christian would have permitted himself voluntarily to alter the history of the last days of Jesus for the purpose of ecclesiastical policy? In the discussion which took place in 170 in the very midst of the churches of Asia, in order to defend the celebration of the feast on the evening of the 14th, in accordance with the established rite, the Gospel of Matthew was founded on (see the passage from Apollinaris, quoted above). Does that in any way prove that that Gospel had appeared only at that period as an engine of war? And from the circumstance that the defenders of the Roman rite might have taken advantage of the fourth Gospel to oppose the Asiatic rite, are we to conclude that that work was composed for that very purpose! No; it is not the Easter controversy which called forth the composition of the one any more than of the other of these Gospels; it is their presence and their authority in the church which have very naturally had an influence on the course of the controversy.

We follow the school of Baur in its retreat, and we place ourselves in front of the second position at which it has taken its stand.

II.

130–155.—VOLKMAR, 155; ZELLER (FROM 1853) AND SCHOLTEN (FROM 1867), 150; HILGENFELD (*Introduction*, 1875), 130–140; KEIM (SINCE 1875), 130.

Our means of review here are Justin Martyr, Montanism, the Valentinian Gnosis, and Marcion. Only three of the works of Justin remain to us, all the three of an apologetic character; two *Apologies* addressed to the Roman senate, and the account of a public discussion which Justin maintained at Ephesus against a learned Jew, the *Dialogue with Trypho*. Since the work of Semisch, the composition of the great *Apology* is generally placed in 138. Some more recent works, amongst which that of Volkmar[1] is the principal, have induced critics to place it in 147. The lesser *Apology* appears to be only a supplement to the first, and should have followed it

[1] *Theolog. Jahrbüch.* 1855.

closely. The *Dialogue* is subsequent to both. Justin was executed at Rome in 166. Keim places the *Apologies* about 160 only, and the *Dialogue* a little later; but for reasons which are by no means convincing. It is well known how the question of the relations of Justin to our Gospels has been the subject of discussion for a century. In 1848, Zeller at length decided to admit the employment of Luke by Justin; in 1850, Hilgenfeld added thereto that of Matthew; then, in 1854, that of Mark. Credner in 1860, and Scholten in 1867, acknowledged that of the three Synoptics, and the first, at length, that of John. Hilgenfeld, in his *Introduction*, has finished by admitting it also: "We find the first trace of John's Gospel amongst the orthodox, and, although in an isolated and subordinate way, in Justin Martyr from 147."[1] For Keim, the question does not admit of doubt. "It is easy to show," he says, "that the Martyr had before his eyes a whole series of Johannine passages."[2]

And, first of all, as Weizsäcker says, the writings of Justin are full of echoes of the doctrine of the Logos in John. *Apol.* ii. 6: "The Word (ὁ λόγος), which was with God (ξυνών) when at the beginning He created all things by it." *Apol.* i. 45: "The first power, after God, the Father and the Master of all, is the Son, the Word, which, having been made flesh in a certain way, became man (ὁ λόγος ὃς τίνα τρόπον σαρκοποιηθεὶς ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν)." *Dial.* c. 105: "Jesus is called the only Son of the Father of all things (μονογενὴς τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων)." And other passages of a similar kind.

The writings of Justin present, besides, quotations of a very varied character. *Dial.* c. 88: "And he (John the Baptist) himself cried: 'I am not the Christ, but the voice of him that crieth.'" Comp. John i. 21–23; *Apol.* i. 63. Justin says of the Jews, that "it is with reason that they have been reproached, both by the prophetic Spirit and by Christ Himself, *with not knowing either the Father or the Son* (ὡς οὔτε τὸν πατέρα οὔτε τὸν υἱὸν ἔγνωκαν)." We recognise the echo of the words which Jesus addresses to the Jews, John viii. 19: "*Ye neither know me nor my Father.*" xvi. 3: "And these things will they do unto you; *because they have not known the Father nor me.*" What are we to think of the impartiality of

[1] *Einleit. in das N. T.*, p. 734. [2] *Gesch. Jesu*, vol. i. p. 138.

Zeller, who prefers to see in those words of Justin an allusion to Matt. xi. 27: "And no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son," even when that latter saying is only a maxim which does not specially refer to the Jews, and which expresses an impossibility rather than a fault. The best known and most debated passage is that which we read in *Apol.* i. 61: "Christ has said: '*Except ye be born anew* (*ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε*), *ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.*' Now it is evident to every one that it is impossible that those who are once born can re-enter into the womb of those who have given birth to them." As there are some variations from the text of John (second person plural instead of the third person singular: *to be born anew, ἀναγεννηθῆναι,* instead of *born from above, γεννᾶσθαι ἄνωθεν*; *enter into,* instead of *see;* the *kingdom of heaven,* instead of the *kingdom of God*), and as that same word is found as a quotation in the *Clementine Recognitions* (vi. 9)[1] and in the *Clementine Homilies* (xi. 26)[2] with analogous deviations, it is maintained in the school of Tübingen that we have here a quotation, not from John's Gospel, but from the Gospel to the Hebrews, in which is said to be found an expression analogous to Matt. xviii. 3: "Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." The relation of these three quotations to the passage in John may be explained in several ways.[3] It is of little consequence. It is impossible, in reading Justin's reflections which follow the words of Jesus,

[1] *Amen dico vobis, nisi quis denuo renatus fuerit ex aqua, non introibit in regna cœlorum.*

[2] Οὕτως ἡμῖν ὥμοσεν ὁ προφήτης εἰπών· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε ὕδατι ζῶντι εἰς ὄνομα πατρός, υἱοῦ, ἁγίου πνεύματος, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν ("If ye are not born anew by the living water in the name of the Father, of the Son, of the Holy Ghost, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven").

[3] The most natural explanation seems to me to be this: Justin and the author of the *Recognitions* each quote John in an independent manner; Justin, not without being under the influence of the passage in Matthew (the second person and the plural). The expression "kingdom of *heaven*" in both arises from the habitual use which they made of Matthew, of whose Gospel they most generally availed themselves. The author of the *Clementine Homilies,* who lived at Rome in 160, and who had John in his hands (see the above notice), the *Recognitions,* and perhaps Justin also, wrote under the influence of those different sources, making use, besides, of the formula of baptism, Matt. xxviii.

not to recognise the reproduction of the objection of Nicodemus: "How can a man be born when he is old? Can he re-enter his mother's womb and be born a second time?" "It is more than arbitrary," Weizsäcker says, with all reason, "to suppose here another source which is unknown to us."[1]

One of the most important passages occurs in the *Dialogue* (c. 25): "I have previously shown that He was the only Son of the Father of all things, His Logos and His power, born of Himself, and afterwards made man by means of the Virgin, *as we have learned from the Memoirs* (*μονογενὴς γὰρ ὅτι ἦν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων οὗτος, ἰδίως ἐξ αὐτοῦ λόγος καὶ δύναμις γεγενημένος καὶ ὕστερον ἄνθρωπος διὰ τῆς παρθένου γενόμενος, ὡς ἐκ τῶν ἀπομνημονευμάτων ἐμάθομεν, ἐδήλωσα*)." Scholten objects that Justin says: *made man*, whilst John says: *made flesh*. As if the expression *σαρκοποιηθείς*, *having been made flesh*, was not also employed in a great number of passages! What gives a peculiar value to that passage is, that Justin declares that he had learnt by the *Apostolic Memoirs*, of which he had made use, the nature and divine pre-existence of Jesus, as well as His incarnation; that express declaration can apply only to the teachings of the fourth Gospel. Hilgenfeld thinks that the expression: "*as we have learnt*," may relate exclusively to that second part of the preceding proposition: "and afterwards made man." As if these last words, as well as the first participle (*γεγενημένος*), were not the attribute of the verb *ἦν* which precedes! There is evidently a single proposition, as there is a single verb; and it is to that proposition, as an entire whole, that the formula refers: "as we have learned."[2]

Volkmar has done well to end by yielding to the evidence, and by recognising a relation of dependence betwixt Justin and John. But are the writers of that school ever done with their expedients? The literary connection once established, he suddenly overturns it, and according to him it is the author of the fourth Gospel who has copied Justin. Keim does justice to that hypothesis: "Who can seriously think of

[1] *Untersuchungen*, p. 228.

[2] Comp. Riggenbach, *Zeugnisse*, pp. 85, 86, where he demonstrates to Hilgenfeld, by a striking example derived from an analogous construction, how he makes use of two weights and two measures, according to the interest of the moment.

making the genial and original author of the Gospel the disciple of a mind so common, so compilatory, dependent, poor in style, as the martyr!" The theology of the author of the fourth Gospel is clear, independent, resting solely on the religious consciousness and the immediate impression produced by the person of Jesus; whilst, as Weizsäcker has shown,[1] the characteristic feature of Justin is to serve as a connecting link between Christian thought, and speculations current outside of Christianity. When we see Justin explaining that the Logos proceeds from the Father, as one fire is kindled by another, without the latter being diminished by it, proving that He differs from the Father *in number* but not in *thought*, composing, in a word, long theological dissertations on the Logos,—we do not comprehend how it can occur to the mind of a sensible critic to make of Justin the antecedent, and of John the consequent. The prologue of John is the primordial revelation of the Logos in its immediate majesty; the writings of Justin are the first attempts at a rational analysis of the contents of that revelation.

Let us pause for a moment in view of those writings which Justin quotes as often as eighteen times, and from which he draws, in a great measure, his knowledge of the Gospel facts. He designates them by the name of *Memoirs of the Apostles* (*ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων*). For, writing to the Roman Senate or conversing with a Jew, he cannot employ the term "*Gospels*," which is not in use outside the church, and he is really forced to borrow the expression which he requires from profane literature. Every one being acquainted with the *ἀπομνημονεύματα* of Xenophon, he has recourse to that designation.[2] Nevertheless, once in the second *Apology* he adds this explanation: "the memoirs which bear the name of Gospels" (*ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια*). And we have seen, in fact, that modern science has proved that amongst those writings were really to be found our three Synoptics, to which we may add, after what has preceded, the Johannine Gospel. Did that collection of evangelic memoirs still include some other

[1] *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* 1867.

[2] It is for the same reason that Justin substitutes for the technical term "*baptism*," the usual term "*bath*;" for that of "*Lord's day*," that of "*day of the Sun*."

work—the Gospel according to the Hebrews, for instance? That is possible; and thus might be explained some traits, quoted by Justin, which are not derived from our canonical Gospels. But evidently the chief documents of that Father were our four Gospels, those by means of which Tatian essayed, shortly after the death of his master, to compose in his *Diatessaron* a single narrative. In the *Dialogue with Trypho*, Justin thus expresses himself on the occasion of an event related by him: "In the memoirs which I say have been composed by *the apostles and by those who have accompanied them.*" That explanation supposes at least two Gospels proceeding from the apostles, and *two* others proceeding from the companions of the apostles. We see how exactly this applies to our canonical collection.

And what does Justin say regarding the employment of those writings at the time when he wrote? Was the use which he himself made of them purely a private use? By no means. He relates that they were used every Lord's day in public worship. "On the day called that of the Sun, all those who dwell in the towns and in the country meet together, and read as much as time permits of the memoirs of the apostles and the writings of the prophets" (*Apol.* i. 67). That collection of Gospels was then received in the churches. They were publicly read by the side of, and as on an equality with, the Old Testament. Now, let it be well remembered that the question is of a time when ecclesiastical usages rested on traditions consecrated by antiquity, and it will be understood how much is implied by the demonstrated presence of the Johannine Gospel in a collection of Gospels, which about 150 were publicly and periodically read in Christian assemblies! And yet attempts have been made to persuade the world that the Johannine Gospel was composed only about 150! We understand how Scholten, Zeller, Volkmar exhaust all the resources of their inventive minds to avert a blow which overturns their hypothesis. Hilgenfeld still remains, who, with more prudence, goes back from 150 to the date of 130 to 140. But would that slight difference be sufficient to parry the stroke? What! the Gospels, and amongst them that of John, were received and read as sacred books, equally with those of the prophets, in the churches, whose worship

Justin described before the Roman Senate, and that Gospel of John had only been in existence for some fifteen years!

The Epistle to Diognetus, often included amongst the works of Justin Martyr, to whom it is still attributed by Otto, introduces a great many expressions and phrases which betray the use of the fourth Gospel. The Lord is in it styled "the Logos, the only-begotten Son, the Truth;" He is "the Creator of the world;" He was "sent by God to men, not to judge, but to save them;" Christians "live in the world, but are not of the world," etc. Only, the time of the composition of that writing is very uncertain. M. Reuss places it about 135; Nitzsch, between 110 and 125, which is the most remote date. On the other hand, Hilgenfeld brings it down even to the time of Marcus Aurelius (161 to 180); Keim and Lipsius, as low as 180; Overbeck comes down as far as the fourth century. The freshness and spirit which distinguish that writing seem to us to assign it its place at the period when Christianity was coming in contact with the cultivated portion of Greek and Roman society, thus in the first third of the second century. But we decline to draw any critical deduction from that book.

MONTANISM made its appearance in the middle of the second century in Phrygia, as a reaction destined to remedy the insufficiency of the official episcopate, as well as the relaxation of discipline and Christian morals. But that reaction was delivered over to the capricious breath of inspiration, to which the prophets and prophetesses of the sect laid claim. Scholten has brought the appearance of our Gospel into connection with that reaction. The author would accept from Montanism the permanence of the gift of prophecy in the church, and the *rôle* of the Holy Spirit as Paraclete supplying the place of Jesus; but, on the other hand, he would put aside the millenarian dreams of the Montanist prophets, and would purify the movement from its fanatical elements. But where do we find in the fourth Gospel anything which bears witness of a special relation to a movement of that kind? Where does the author put into the mouth of Jesus a single word which foretells a future decay of Christian life and morals? Where is there a single expression which tends to put the church on her guard against the mechanical action of an official ministry? The approaching arrival of the Spirit is announced in a manner

essentially identical with the promises included in the Synoptics, and without the least allusion to a reactionary movement of the Montanist kind. So magnificent a structure as that of the history of Christ in the fourth Gospel cannot have been produced by so inadequate a cause. Theodoret affirms that Montanus called himself *Paraclete, Logos, Bridegroom.* If it is so, the use of our Gospel by that founder of the sect is evident. Now Montanus appeared about 140. At that period—as we have just convinced ourselves from the quotations of Justin—our Gospel was already spread abroad, and publicly read in the churches. It is not, therefore, our Gospel which was called forth by Montanism; it is Montanism which took its stand on our Gospel, in order to strive against the decline of the established church.[1]

Scholten, in like manner, places the composition of our Gospel in connection with the appearance of the Gnostic heresy of Valentinus. But it is Hilgenfeld who has especially connected his name with that explanation of the origin of the Johannine writing. Valentinus, as Eusebius tells us, arrived at Rome in the time of Hyginus, that is to say, between 136 and 140; he must have died in Cyprus about 160. The greatest resemblances may be observed between his terminology and that of our Gospel. The celestial powers, proceeding in pairs from the eternal abyss, according to his theory, bear names which are almost all to be found in the Johannine prologue, or in the remainder of the Gospel: *Logos* (λόγος), *light* (φῶς), *truth* (ἀλήθεια), *favour* (χάρις), *life* (ζωή), *only Son* (μονογενής), *Paraclete* (παράκλητος). Here the question presents itself, Which is the source, John or Gnosticism? For a fortuitous coincidence is inadmissible. The reasons in favour of the priority of the Gospel are these: The common terms are employed in John's prologue in their simple, natural, I shall add, biblical sense, in the sense in which the greater part of them already belong to the language of the Old Testament; whilst in the writings of Valentinus they appear in an artificial and forced sense, like the names of the fantastic actors in a mythological drama. Under such conditions, the

[1] Keim draws the same conclusion: "Montanism has derived its ideas from the surrounding Church, and the latter might already find itself under the influence of the fourth Gospel." *Gesch. Jesu,* vol. i. pp. 154–155.

question of priority is solved without difficulty. "Everything leads us to admit," says Bleek, "that the Gnostics made use of those expressions, which they met with in a valued work, as points of support, intended to sustain their speculative system."[1] Moreover, how can we explain, as Keim says, by that indefinite series of emanations which open up an access on the part of the world to the Infinite Being, that idea of the Father's love which draws near to the world in His Well-beloved, and communicates to it eternal life? And how can we imagine, for one instant, that that second view could be an imitation, or even a *correction*, of the first?

The Fathers, finally, unanimously attest that the procedure of that sect consisted, not in forging writings in accordance with their system, but in adapting their system as far as possible to the writings of Scripture. "Valentinus makes use," says Tertullian, "of the *whole instrument* (the sacred collection). He has not composed the Scriptures after his doctrine, but based his doctrine on the Scriptures" (*De Præscr. Hæret.* c. 38). This is what distinguishes him from Marcion, who falsified the sacred writings in order to adapt them to his doctrine. Irenæus says the same thing: "The disciples of Valentinus avail themselves in the most complete manner of the Gospel according to John to demonstrate their syzygies (pairs of aeons)" (*Adv. Hær.* iii. 11. 7). Finally, we possess quotations from our Gospel attributed to Valentinus himself. Hippolytus relates of him, in the *Philosophumena* (vi. 35), that *he says* (*φησί*): "All the prophets and the law spoke according to the Demiurge, the insensate God. It is on this account that the Saviour says: 'All those who came before me were thieves and robbers.'" (Comp. John x. 8.) And, according to vi. 33, the Johannine name of the devil: "the prince of this world (*ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*)," was employed by Valentinus. The answer is given: It is true that these quotations do not certainly belong to the leader of the school, but probably to his disciples, who wrote at a period subsequent to the appearance of the Gospel. The confusion between the master and the disciples is doubtless not impossible; nevertheless, Hippolytus certainly appears to desire to

[1] See that same idea eloquently expanded by Keim, *Gesch. Jesu*, vol. i. p. 152.

quote an expression of Valentinus himself: "*he says.*" But, in any case, without insisting on an isolated quotation, how should the whole of the system not proceed from the leader of the school? Can we believe that Valentinus arrived in Rome from Egypt to impart public instruction regarding Christianity, without having a system determined in its leading features?[1] Basilides expounded at Alexandria a complete system of Christian philosophy; Valentinus arrived from the East to do likewise. And would not that which forms the foundation of his Gnosticism, the great drama of emanations, be his own conception? That supposition is historically inadmissible. Heinrici also terminates his profound investigation into the relation of the Valentinian Gnosticism to our sacred writings with this conclusion: "From the mode of quotation employed, it is demonstrably evident that the Valentinians used Scripture as a universally recognised authority; that it consequently possessed that authority previous to the appearance of the system. . . . The use which the Valentinians made of Scripture proves (in particular) that the Gospel of John and the Epistles to the Colossians and to the Ephesians were acknowledged writings, and already employed as apostolic writings in the first half of the second century." It is no longer possible, in presence of that fact, to place the composition of those writings about 140, nor even about 130.

Eusebius places the arrival of Marcion at Rome after the death of Hyginus, thus after 140. He came from Asia, where he seems to have already displayed his talents as a Heresiarch. He had been excommunicated by his father, the Bishop of Sinope, for scandalous conduct. The biography of Manes, by Fihrist, recently published by Flügel,[2] places the arrival of Marcion in the first year of Antoninus, therefore from 138 to 139, which almost agrees with the date given by Eusebius. Hamack[3] has even rendered it probable, by the combination of a multitude of patristic data, that Marcion was really older than Valentinus and Basilides, and that Clement of Alexandria was not deceived in asserting the priority of Marcion, as he does in *Strom.* vii. 17. Marcion would consequently be the first

[1] G. Heinrici, *die Valentinianische Gnosis und die heil. Schrift.*
[2] Mani, *seine Lehren und seine Schriften*, 1862.
[3] *Zeitschrift für histor. Theol.* 1874.

of the great Heresiarchs of the second century; and it would not be without reason that Polycarp is said to have apostrophized him by the name of "the first-born of Satan" (*πρωτότοκος τοῦ σατανᾶ*).[1] The Gospel of which he made use was a mutilated Luke; he had cut out of it, as Judaic interpolations due to the unintelligent Christianity of the Twelve, all that tended to make God the Creator and God the Redeemer one and the same God. For, in his eyes, nature was in contradiction with grace, and legal righteousness with gospel love. He denied the reality of the body of Christ, and taught that Jesus had directly descended from heaven to earth, without having passed through a corporeal birth. Was he acquainted with any other Gospels besides his expurgated Luke? In his treatise, *de carne Christi* (c. ii.), Tertullian apostrophizes him thus: "Thou who, when thou wert a Christian, hast fallen *in cutting off what thou hast previously believed*, as thou hast thyself confessed in a certain letter."[2] Did that "cutting off" (literally: by way of tearing, *rescindere*) refer to Christian *doctrine* in general, which he had denied, or to sacred *writings*, which he had either rejected or mutilated, after having formerly accepted them? Certainly, the Latin term applies more naturally to documents than to doctrines. But in order to arrive at certainty on that point, we must compare two other passages of Tertullian's treatise against Marcion, *Adv. Marc.* iv. 3: "Marcion, finding the Epistle to the Galatians, in which Paul accuses the apostles themselves of not walking in the truth of the Gospel, and at the same time reproaches certain false apostles with perverting the Gospel, strives by means of that to destroy confidence in the Gospels which are *published in the name of the apostles and also of apostolical men*, in order to bring to bear upon his own the faith which he takes away from them." Marcion then, according to Tertullian, was acquainted with other Gospels than his own, some of which proceeded from apostles, others from apostolical men. And it was the passage in Gal. ii. which he made use of in order to destroy their authority. Now, what apostles or apostolical assistants are designated in Gal. ii.? James,

[1] See Luthardt, pp. 83 and 84.

[2] *Qui cum fuisses Christianus, excidisti, rescindendo quod retro credidisti, sicut et ipse confiteris in quadam epistola.*

Cephas, and John (ver. 9). Marcion's mode of arguing infers, then, the existence of John's Gospel, and perhaps that of the Gospel of Mark, as proceeding from Peter. Such a conclusion is confirmed, in so far as the Gospel of John is concerned, by those words in the first treatise quoted: "If thou hadst not *rejected* the writings opposed to thy system, the Gospel of John would be there to convince thee" (*de carne Christi*, c. iii.). It seems tolerably evident from all those passages that Marcion had formerly possessed and admitted the Gospel of John, and that he had afterwards rejected it, keeping only that of Luke, which he had found means of adapting to his system.

But Volkmar, and then Messrs. Reville and Renan, ask why Marcion did not rather choose, if it was already in existence, the Gospel of John, which was in perfect agreement with his Antinomian spiritualism. That question testifies to a strange ignorance of the fourth Gospel. Nothing is more foreign to the Johannine mind, as we have shown, than that violent Antinomianism and that Docetism which are the characteristic features of Marcion's system. According to the fourth Gospel, the world is entirely made by the Logos; and Marcion attributes the creation of it to a Demiurge of limited power! In coming into the world in the midst of Israel, Jesus came *to His own;* and the world, and the Jews themselves, according to Marcion, are of an anti-divine origin! Jesus was made flesh; and Marcion refuses Him a body! Jesus had, according to our Gospel, a mother and brethren; and Marcion denies His birth! In order to believe in Jesus, we must believe in the writings of Moses, which bear witness of the Christ; and Marcion establishes a radical opposition between the law and the Gospel. The testimony which Jesus bears to Himself is from one end to the other the application of the theocratic symbols; and Marcion makes the Old and the New Covenants the works of two opposed divinities! That is the way in which the fourth Gospel harmonizes with the system of Marcion! In order to make use of it, he would need to mutilate it in every chapter; he preferred to strike it off at a blow.

We add to the two great Heresiarchs, Valentinus and Marcion, the one who seems to have been at Alexandria, the predecessor of Valentinus, Basilides. He must have died, according to Jerome (*De viris illustribus*, c. xxi.), after

132. Eusebius places the time of his activity under Adrian (117 to 138). M. de Groot, in his interesting work upon Basilides (p. 4), has brought forward the following passage from the *Philosophumena* of Hippolytus: "Basilides, and Isidore, his true son and disciple, say that Matthias had communicated to them verbally the secret doctrines which he had received from the Saviour in His private instructions." It would follow from this passage that Basilides, if he did not wish to be at once taxed with falsehood, must have been the contemporary of Matthias, that twelfth apostle appointed to replace Judas, and that consequently he was already living in the first century. The statement of Epiphanius confirms this (*Hær.* xxiii. 1–7, xxiv. 1), according to which Basilides had already taught at Antioch before coming to Alexandria. He might, in that capital of Syria, have met the Apostle Matthias; from that intercourse he derived the right to put his system under his guarantee.[1] If Basilides, then, had made use of our Gospel, the quotations of such a writer would place the composition of the Johannine work at the latest in the first years of the second century. We can understand how the modern school had to array all its forces to eliminate a fact which, more seriously than the preceding ones, contradicts its most cherished assertions.

According to Origen (Hom. I. on Luke), Basilides had already taken the liberty of writing a *Gospel according to Basilides*.[2] That statement is confirmed by Jerome in the prologue of his *Commentary on Matthew*. It appears even that he had written an exegetical work on the Gospel, in twenty-four books. Clement of Alexandria has presented to us some passages of it. In the *Stromata* (Book iv.) he thus expresses himself: "Basilides says in the twenty-third book of his *Commentaries*."[3] He was refuted by Agrippa Castor, under Adrian.[4] The expression of Clement allows us with

[1] Hilgenfeld, *Einl.* p. 48, prefers to admit that there was no foundation in the assertion of Basilides, and that he had merely taken advantage of a book entitled *Traditions of Matthias*. But that would imply that that book was the private property of Basilides and Isidore.

[2] Ἤδη δέ τινες καὶ Βασιλείδης γράψαι κατὰ Βασιλείδην εὐαγγέλιον.

[3] Ἐν τῷ εἰκοστῷ τρίτῳ τῶν ἐξηγητικῶν.

[4] Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 7. 7: "There has come down even to us a work by Agrippa Castor, an illustrious writer of that period. It is a very solid refutation

difficulty to identify these two works of Basilides. It no longer appears that the *Gospel* commented on by him could be the evangelical doctrine in general; it must be an evangelical work, a Gospel properly so called, for the term *exegesis* only applies to a written text. Could that text have been the Gospel of Basilides himself? That meaning is very improbable in itself. The term *Gospel* in the mouth of Agrippa Castor can only designate the evangelical collection received in the church. In accordance with that, when Hippolytus, in the *Philosophumena*, quotes Basilides in these terms, vii. 22: "And here is, says he (Basilides), what is said in the Gospels, 'It was the true light which lighteth every man' (John i. 9), and vii. 27: 'Let every thing have its appointed time,' says he (Basilides), is what the Saviour sufficiently declares in these words: 'My hour is not yet come'" (John ii. 4), it is very difficult not to see therein textual quotations taken from those commentaries of Basilides on the Gospels. It is objected that the statement of the system of Basilides by Hippolytus cannot be relied on; that that Father gives a different colouring to that system from Irenæus. According to the latter, Basilides must have been a Dualist; according to the former, on the contrary, a Pantheist; from which it would follow that Hippolytus must have worked on some writings of the school of Basilides, dating from a subsequent period. But even if that difference were to be settled at the expense of Hippolytus, that would not prevent the special quotations, such as those we have just given, from being exact. M. de Groot observes, not without reason, a difference in the manner in which that Father quotes Valentinus and Basilides. When he quotes the first, he says: "*Valentinus and his successors . . . the school of Valentinus; the school of the Valentinians . . . .* say." For Valentinus was, from the beginning of his work, surrounded by a whole school of independent thinkers, who, after having been his disciples, became his successors, and developed the common system. It was not so with Basilides, who had, with the exception of his son Isidore, as successor no original thinker capable of working out in an independent manner the ideas of

of Basilides, in which he recalls the fact that the latter had written twenty-four books on the Gospel."

his master. Irenæus likewise quotes him, briefly saying: "Basilides says" (*Adv. Hær.* i. 24, *ii.* 35); and Hippolytus opposes the *school* of Valentinus to the *system* of Basilides.[1] Weizsäcker also draws attention to this fact, that when Hippolytus quotes a *writing*, he does so under the form of direct discourse, introducing the textual quotation by the words, *he says* (φησί); whilst, when he quotes the opinions of a school, he does so under the form of indirect discourse, with the formula, *they say that* (λέγουσιν). Now, says Weizsäcker, the quotations of Basilides belong to the first class, and seem thus to be borrowed in a consistent manner from a work which Hippolytus has before him.

When we put all these facts together, we can no longer doubt that we have here textual quotations from the very works of Basilides. This is what Weizsäcker, as a critic, independent of the prejudices of any school, acknowledges. "It cannot be doubted that we have here quotations from a writing of Basilides, in which the Johannine Gospel was employed" (p. 233).

Party spirit may undoubtedly disregard the value of these facts. But in the eyes of the simple historian they are sufficient to set aside the possibility of the composition of our Gospel after the year 130.

Hilgenfeld has endeavoured to find support for the contrary opinion in some internal indications. He sees in the passage from John v. 43: "I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not; if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive," an allusion to the false messiah Barcochab, and finds such an explanation confirmed by xvi. 2: "The time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service,"—words which would recall the horrible persecutions of the Christians by that false messiah. By similar proofs, it would not be difficult to demonstrate that the writings of the New Testament are all subsequent to the time of the Reformation, since there is not a single one of them in which an expression may not be found capable of being applied, if we wish, to some circumstance of that great

[1] "But as I think I have sufficiently expounded the vain doctrines . . . of the successors of the *Valentinian School*, let us also observe what Basilides says."

ecclesiastical crisis. Jewish history reckons no fewer than sixty-four false messiahs previous to Barcochab; and the persecutions of the Jews against the Christians certainly did not commence in the year 132! The martyrdom of Stephen (in 36 or 37), and that of the two Jameses (in 44 and 62), attest the truth of this. Keim's proofs in favour of this date of 130 are scarcely of more value. He quotes the use made of the Synoptics in the fourth Gospel. But what if our Synoptic Gospels existed before the year 80, as Holtzmann[1] himself recognised some years ago? He quotes the Romanizing of Judea, the substitution of the worship in spirit and in truth for the worship at Jerusalem and Gerizim. All that previously led him only to 110 or 115; why, all at once, does he now bring it down to the year 130? And in what respect do the facts quoted lead him to go beyond the year 100? The first was accomplished before the year 70, the other in that year. Keim further alleges the weakening of the expectation of the Parousia, which is observable in our Gospel. But is not the first Epistle (by the same author) full of that expectation? And, besides, why should that decline not have taken place towards the end of the first century, as well as at the beginning of the second? As for the Polemic against certain Gnostic heresies in the first Epistle, it proves absolutely nothing. We shall show that at the end of the first century there were already opportunities enough to combat the nascent Gnosticism.

But here is a more serious discovery. Our Gospel omits the narrative of Simon the Cyrenian bearing the cross. From what could such an omission arise in that writing, if not from this, that Basilides took advantage, for his own benefit, of that feature in the Synoptic narrative, and pretended that the Jews, being deceived, had crucified Simon instead of Jesus, who all that time was laughing at them? There is an argument which ought to prove that our Gospel was composed after Basilides! We have only one answer to return to that; that is, that if the object be to bring criticism into discredit, there is no more effectual means of so doing than by employing such arguments. Will Keim undertake to find an analogous reason for all the omissions which are found in the narrative

[1] *Die Synopt. Evangelien*, p. 414.

of the fourth Gospel? The circumstance relating to Simon of Cyrene had already been thrice related in the Gospels which were in circulation throughout the church; to what purpose reproduce it in a fourth narrative, which, moreover, answered to a special design?

The second position sought for by the critical school is shown, then, to be as untenable as the first, and there only remains for us to examine the third, that of Keim (1867), of Schenkel, and, without doubt, also of MM. Renan, Nicolas, etc.: the first part of the second century, especially the years from 110 to 115, as Keim still said, not more than seven or eight years ago.

III.

100-120.—Keim (1867), 110-115; Nicolas, Weizsacker, Renan, etc.

It is the apostolic Fathers, Ignatius, Polycarp, Papias, who furnish us with the means of review in relation to this new situation. We shall here begin with the oldest of the three, for reasons which will explain themselves.

Ignatius, bishop of the church of Antioch from the end of the first century, must have perished as a martyr in the reign of Trajan. Unanimous tradition, confirmed by the testimony of authors who wrote at Antioch itself, such as Chrysostom and Evagrius, bears that he perished at Rome, devoured by wild beasts, to which he was exposed in the circus. It was at that time the custom to supply the circus of the capital from the provinces. According to a chronicler of the eighth century,[1] Ignatius must have perished at Antioch itself, where he is said to have been condemned to death by the Emperor Trajan. But it is very improbable that the church of Antioch, if it had had the honour of beholding such a martyrdom with its own eyes, would so easily have abdicated that glory in favour of Rome. It was whilst proceeding from Antioch to Rome, where that punishment awaited him, that Ignatius wrote the seven letters which have been preserved to us, and which may claim to be authentic. An enlarged recension is in existence, which has been augmented by eight new letters.

[1] Jean Malalas. Volkmar has naturally given his full assent to that statement.

Zahn, in his remarkable work on *Ignatius of Antioch*,[1] has not only proved, what was generally admitted, the spuriousness of these amplifications, as well as of these eight new letters, but he has put his finger on the tendency and on the period to which these fraudulent alterations must be assigned. They are borrowed from the semi-Arian tendency, and proceed from a theologian of that party, who, after the Council of Nice, was desirous of acquiring the reputation of orthodoxy, and, to attain that end, was not afraid of presenting his views under the cover of the old bishop. In a word, they are most probably the work of Acacius, the successor of Eusebius at Cæsarea, and one of the least honourable representatives of the semi-Arian party. The recension, which includes only the seven letters, and under the most concise form, is that which Eusebius used. A recent discovery has supplied a specious argument to the opponents of their authenticity. Three of these seven letters have been found in Syriac, and under a much briefer form still. They have been published by M. Cureton. Setting out with the principle, natural enough in itself, that the shortest text is likewise the most authentic, criticism has in general declared itself in favour of that Syriac edition; with the exception, however, of the theologians of the school of Tübingen, who prefer to reject the whole, the Greek letters of both recensions, and the Syriac letters, as altogether spurious. The following are their reasons: The constitution of the episcopate, such as it is represented in these letters, is that of a very advanced period of the second century, and consequently long subsequent to the death of Ignatius, which must have taken place about 110. It is the same with the heresy which is frequently controverted in them. It supposes the existence of the great Gnostic systems of the middle of the second century. These two reasons are not well founded. For the episcopate, such as it is described by Ignatius, is still purely parochial, by no means provincial; and under that form its existence, about the close of the first century, can be already established in the Apocalypse, where the *angel* of the church designates the president of the presbyterial body, in so far as representative of the whole church. For a long time that post in the church of Jerusalem had been filled by James

[1] *Ignatius von Antiochien*, 1873.

the brother of the Lord, then by his cousin and successor Simeon, two bishops in the true sense which Ignatius attaches to that title. As to the supposed heresy contained in the letters of Ignatius, all its premises were already in existence in the first century, as we shall show farther on. The false teachers of Colosse were in a fair way to belong to that tendency. Cerinthus, the contemporary of John at Ephesus, took a further step in the same direction. The germs of Gnosticism were sown with a full hand in the East at the close of the life of Ignatius. The two reasons alleged are, then, without any value. In return, the incomparable originality of those letters, and the altogether inimitable character of the person who is revealed in them, are speaking proofs of authenticity; and it is not without reason that Rothe regards those who can misconceive them as destitute of a sense of literary appreciation.[1]

The real question is, then, that of choosing between the Syriac edition, and the Greek edition made use of by Eusebius. It is on this point that Zahn appears to us to have thrown a clear light. He has proved that the three Syriac letters are only extracts; that the complete Syriac text, implied by these extracts, really existed in the fourth century; that it had even been already translated into Armenian in the fifth. These extracts must have been the work of some Syrian monk living between the sixth and the eighth century. He has omitted everything in the contents which was not of a directly edifying nature, consequently all those personal details which are to us precisely the most interesting part of the letters. The frequent incoherences which strike us in those extracts, and which are only to be explained by referring to the Greek text, do not leave us in any doubt regarding the author's method of procedure. In the Epistle to the Romans (chap. iv.) he himself speaks of letters addressed by Ignatius to *all the churches*. Now, his collection only contains two besides that to the Romans, that addressed to the Ephesians and that to Polycarp; and the latter cannot be reckoned amongst the letters to the churches. Criticism has therefore a right to regard the shorter Greek recension as the true text, with the exception of some slight interpolations which Zahn has sufficiently pointed out. The following passage, moreover, occurs in both texts,

[1] *Aufänge der christlichen Kirche*, p. 715.

Rom. chap. vii.: "The living water speaking within me says to me, Come to the Father. I take no pleasure either in the maintenance of corruption or in the joys of this life: I want the bread of God—the heavenly bread, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ. I want the drink of God, His blood, which is incorruptible love and eternal life." Such words are undoubtedly a reminiscence of those of Jesus to the Samaritan woman. "The water which I shall give thee shall be in thee a well of water springing up into everlasting life" (John iv.); and especially of the discourse of Jesus at Capernaum, after the multiplication of the loaves: "I am the living bread which came down from heaven; for my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed" (John vi.).[1]

Besides that, we read in the Epistle to the Philadelphians (chap. vii.): "The spirit does not go astray, for it is from God. It knows whence it cometh and whither it goeth, and it condemns secret things." The allusion to John iii. 8 and 20 is unquestionable.

In the same Epistle, Jesus is called "the door of the Father (*θύρα τοῦ πατρός*), by which Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, the prophets, the apostles, the church enter in" (comp. John x. 9).

In the Epistle to the Ephesians, chap. vii. (but not in the Syriac text), Jesus is called, "God come in the flesh" (*ἐνσαρκὶ γενόμενος Θεός*); and in that to the Magnesians, chap. viii., "the eternal Word of God (*αὐτοῦ λόγος ἀΐδιος*)." Riggenbach remarks the urgency with which the idea of *union* (*ἕνωσις*) is dwelt upon in the Epistle to Polycarp, chap. i. and elsewhere, in such a way as indubitably to recall John xvii.

Yet one more fact will suffice: Hilgenfeld, who places the composition of our letters in 166, makes no difficulty in recognising the two quotations of John in Romans, chap. vii., and Philadelphians, chap. vii., and in adding that "the whole theology of the letters of Ignatius rests on the Gospel of John;" so that if, as we believe we have proved, these letters really date from the year 110,—the time of his journey to Rome,—we have in those writings the irrefragable proof of the existence of the fourth Gospel from the close of the first century.

[1] The Syriac form is a little shorter: "I wish the bread of God, which is the flesh of Christ; and I wish as a drink His blood, which is incorruptible love."

The authenticity of the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians is forcibly set aside, as well as that of the letters of Ignatius, by the school of Tübingen; for it includes some passages relating to the latter, which, if they proceeded from the pen of Polycarp, could leave no doubt concerning the authenticity of these latter. A middle view has been tried. Ritschl has proposed to reject those passages, whilst retaining the rest. But in that case, how has no copy of the primitive form been preserved in the church? Jerome informs us that the Epistle of Polycarp began to be publicly read in the churches immediately after the death of that Father. How, under such conditions, could the interpolation have diffused itself throughout the scattered copies? Moreover, as Zahn has shown, deprived of its relation to the letters of Ignatius, that of Polycarp loses its purpose. No further motive can be alleged for its existence than the infidelity of a deacon of Philippi and of his wife, whom Polycarp commends to the compassion of the church. Would he have written solely for such a purpose? Polycarp is still ignorant of what is occurring at Rome. He desires, if possible, to get news speedily from Ignatius. His letter must then have closely followed the passing of the martyr through Smyrna when he was on his way to Rome, and must date consequently from the years 110 or 111. It includes, not quotations from the Johannine Gospel, but a passage manifestly borrowed from the first Epistle: "For whoever does not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is antichrist" (comp. 1 John iv. 3: "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist"). Baur and Zeller would only see in this a fortuitous coincidence. The two authors have quoted a maxim which was in circulation in the church under a form which had become technical. Volkmar, following the example of Bretschneider, recognises a relation of dependence between the two passages; but it is the author of the Johannine writing—the pseudo-John—who copies Polycarp. And nevertheless, it is quite enough to read ten lines of the two writings to determine to which side the priority belongs. The work of John is original throughout. It is written in a style and form of thought which, save the other Johannine writings, have not their equal

in the entire range of profane or sacred literature; whilst the work of Polycarp, quite filled with biblical passages, merely presents a faint reproduction of the common Christianity. Polycarp may be read twenty times; still no distinct impression remains on the mind. Let John be *read once;* that type without parallel will remain present to the mind. And yet we are to regard as sound criticism, that which would persuade us that the work of Polycarp is the original, and that of John the copy!

If Polycarp, then, who was acquainted with John, made use of his Epistle, he has also admitted its apostolic origin; and as all criticism at the present day acknowledges that an identity exists between the author of that Epistle and that of the fourth Gospel, the consequence to be deduced in reference to the opinion of Polycarp concerning the latter book is not doubtful.

But an objection is raised. Why, in that case, does Polycarp never quote our Gospel in that letter? Why, we may inquire in our turn, does not every minister, in each of his sermons, quote all the writings of that New Testament which he has in his hands? Polycarp, as well as Irenæus, undoubtedly admitted the Apocalypse. He does not quote it either. Perhaps if we possessed some of the other letters which, according to Irenæus, he had addressed to different churches, the first thing we would discover in them would be words borrowed from the fourth Gospel. The example of the discovery of the *Clementine Homilies* by Dressel should make us cautious when it is a question of the *argumentum e silentio.* But that same argument returns with double force when we have to do with *Papias;* and this time it threatens to overwhelm us altogether. Eusebius, in fact, who was acquainted with the work of Papias, entitled *Explanations of the Words of the Lord* (λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις), in five books, quotes his testimony regarding the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, and mentions the quotations which he borrowed from 1 John and 1 Peter; but he does not transcribe a single word from Papias in reference to John, which implies that that Father either was not acquainted with it,—that is to say, that the fourth Gospel did not exist,—or that he did not recognise it as apostolic,—that is to say, that it did not proceed from John.

First of all, let us rectify what is inaccurate in that statement. Eusebius by no means quotes a *testimony* from Papias regarding the authenticity of Matthew and Mark, for that fact did not need to be attested. No one doubted it at the time of Papias. He only relates some interesting *information* which had been supplied to Papias in part or in whole by an ancient presbyter—probably John the Presbyter—on certain peculiar circumstances relating to the origin of these two writings. If Eusebius, moreover, makes mention of the quotations from 1st John and 1st Peter in Papias, it is because those letters formed a portion of the Catholic Epistles, the greater part of which were disputed; and as he distinguished these two Epistles from all the others of the same group, by ascribing to them the quality of *homologoumena* (universally received), he was bound to justify that distinction by mentioning the use which Papias made of these two writings. It is the same reason which calls forth on the part of Eusebius an analogous observation on the use which Polycarp also made of these two letters. He is silent, on the contrary, as to the use of Paul's Epistles by Polycarp,—a use which we nevertheless can ourselves demonstrate. Wherefore that silence? Simply because the authenticity of those letters did not require to be established. The silence of Eusebius on the use of our Gospel by Papias may then also really signify that that writing was received without dispute, to such a degree that its quality as a homologoumenon had no need to be established by positive witnesses.

It may be useful to examine here a little more closely the manner in which Eusebius expresses himself on the method which he followed in his work (*H. E.* iii. 3. 3): "He wishes to point out," he says, "what ecclesiastical writers made use of the disputed books, and of which of them; then *some of the things* (τινά) which have been said about those writings of the New Testament which were universally received, and *all* that has been said (ὅσα) concerning those which are not so." In regard to the homologoumena, he did not by any means aim at being *complete*. In certain cases only, when there was something *remarkable* to cite with regard to them, he reserved to himself the right to mention it; it is thus that he acted in respect to Matthew and Mark; then similarly in reference to 1st Peter and 1st John, which it was of consequence to keep

apart from the other Catholic Epistles. In regard to the antilegomena, on the contrary, he proposed to omit nothing. After such an explanation, does his procedure in reference to the quotations from John, which might be met with in Papias, contain anything suspicious? What would be equivocal, or even decidedly compromising, would be the silence which Eusebius should have permitted himself to keep in reference to a fact so extraordinary as would have been in his eyes the absence of any allusion to John's Gospel by such a writer as Papias. It would, indeed, be impossible to absolve Eusebius from the reproach of bad faith, if, in the face of such silence, he could have fully affirmed, as he does not cease to do, that the fourth Gospel was absolutely a homologoumenon. To sum up all, it is certainly easier to explain the silence of Eusebius concerning the quotations from John in Papias, if they existed, than his silence on the entire absence of similar quotations, if they had been wholly wanting.

I have reasoned thus far on the supposition that we have not really, in the short fragments of Papias which remain to us, any trace of the use of the fourth Gospel. Is such a supposition well grounded?

Let us, first of all, observe that expression of which Papias makes use: "The commandments given to the faith *by the Lord*, and which come to us *from the Truth itself*." Is there not in that expression: *the Truth itself*, employed as synonymous with the latter: *the Lord*, a trace of the Johannine language ("I am the Truth," John xiv. 6)? Leimbach next brings out two remarkable facts: first, we may remember that in the passage from Papias, in which he enumerates his apostolic and other authorities, he twice names John (see pp. 60, 61). Eusebius says that by the former of these two notices "Papias evidently means to designate the *evangelist*" (σαφῶς δηλῶν τὸν εὐαγγελιστήν). Could Eusebius have expressed himself in such a way if he had not found in the work of Papias the certain proof that he looked upon John as the author of a Gospel—if he had even found in it proof to the contrary? No; in that case, since he here wished to give the idea of Papias, he would assuredly have said, *the apostle*. Second, the passage of Irenæus on the origin of our four Gospels is well known (*Adv. Hær.* iii. 1. 1). It is enough,

says Leimbach, to compare that passage with the well-known testimony of Papias concerning Matthew and Mark, in order to be convinced that Irenæus, in what he relates of the origin of these two writings, only reproduces what he had read in Papias. What conclusion is to be drawn from that save this, that the details which Irenæus immediately adds regarding Luke and John are likewise derived from the same source?—from which it follows, that the Gospel of John was in the hands of Papias, as well as those of Matthew and of Mark.

But here is the essential and really decisive fact. In the enumeration of the apostles and immediate disciples of Jesus, which we have given at p. 49, Papias places *Andrew* at the head, then *Peter, Philip, Thomas;* afterwards, *James, John,* and *Matthew;* finally, he indicates two disciples of the Lord who were not apostles: *Aristion* and the *Presbyter John.* Now Andrew is named once in the Synoptic narrative, and he is placed after Peter (Matt. iv. 18; Mark i. 16); when he is once more mentioned in the apostolical catalogue (Matt. x. 2; Mark iii. 17), it is again after Peter, and even in Mark after James and John. Now we know that it is he, on the contrary, who in the fourth Gospel plays the principal part as the first disciple of Jesus, and to whom the conversion of Peter and of the other disciples is due. As to Philip and Thomas, they do not once appear on the stage throughout the whole of the Synoptic history; but they, as well as Andrew, in return play a prominent part in the narrative of the fourth Gospel. Comp. for all the three the following instances: for Andrew, besides i. 41, vi. 8 and xii. 22; for Philip, i. 44, vi. 5, xii. 21, and xiv. 8; for Thomas, xi. 16, xiv. 5; finally, xx. 24. And it is precisely those apostles that Papias mentions in preference to Simon Peter! That is not all: the *order* in which all those apostles are enumerated by Papias is not less significant. The first three apostles designated by him are precisely the first three disciples indicated by name in the Johannine narrative (chap. i.): Andrew, Peter, Philip,—and they are so exactly in the order in which they appear in the narrative of John (vv. 41, 42, 44). This is the explanation of the placing of Andrew first in reference to Peter, which at once strikes us with surprise; for it is contrary to all the precedents offered by the Synoptics. After those three apostles,

Papias refers to two of them whom our Gospel, it is true, does not *name* for an altogether special reason, James and John, but who are nevertheless indicated in the narrative,—the one as the *disciple whom Jesus loved;* the other, i. 41 (see the exegesis), and perhaps xviii. 15, both in every instance under the name of the *sons of Zebedee.* We ask only why John is placed by Papias after James? It may perhaps be to bring him nearer to Matthew, with whom he has in common the title of *evangelist.* Amongst all those persons, Matthew is the only one who is not named in the fourth Gospel. It is probably the mention of John which causes that of the author of the fourth Gospel. John is naturally placed first of the two, as being specially the evangelist of the churches of Asia. Finally, there appear at the end of the list two disciples who did not belong to the circle of the Twelve, Aristion and the Presbyter John. Papias designates them as *the disciples of the Lord* (*οἱ τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταί*). Now the fourth Gospel mentions precisely in the closing scene (chap. xxi.), "*two other of His disciples*" (*ἄλλοι ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δύο*). After all the coincidences which we have just pointed out, is there not every reason to think that those two persons indicated in John xxi. are no other than that Aristion and that Presbyter John who likewise close the enumeration of Papias? But whatever be the case with that last supposition, one fact appears established; that is, the view which Papias held of the evangelical history was formed under the influence of the Johannine narrative much rather than under that of the Synoptics.[1] And yet it is alleged that Papias neither *knew* nor *recognised* the fourth Gospel!

Irenæus mentions an explanation which the presbyters of Asia Minor (in the number of whom Papias occupied for him one of the first places) gave of that expression in the fourth Gospel: "In my Father's house are many mansions."[2] That fact demonstrates that our Gospel was known and made use of in the circles in which Papias lived. Finally, it appears from another passage of Irenæus (ii. 22), that those same presbyters related, as receiving it from the mouth of John, that

[1] M. Steitz is the first who has pointed out the relation between the enumeration of Papias and the Johannine narrative.

[2] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* v. 36. Routh, *Reliquiæ sacræ*, i. p. 12.

Jesus had reached the age of 40 to 50. That is evidently an error, which can only be explained by a misconception arising from those words of the Jews in our Gospel (viii. 57): "Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?" How can we, after that, entertain the slightest suspicion relative to the position which Papias took in reference to the Johannine writings? And if we could still entertain a doubt, one fact would succeed in convincing us. That is the use, well established by Eusebius, which Papias made of the first Epistle of John.[1] We think we have proved (pp. 48, 49), and several of our usual opponents, Scholten, Hilgenfeld, Keim, seem to agree with us on that point, that Papias must have composed his work about 100–110. For at the time when he wrote his preface, Aristion and John the presbyter were still alive.[2] If our Gospel, then, has exercised over him the influence which we have demonstrated, it must necessarily have existed before the beginning of the second century.

An analogous conclusion would result from the work entitled *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, if its date were certain. It is in any case anterior to the second destruction of Jerusalem in 135; for the prophecies put into the mouth of the twelve sons of Jacob do not anywhere make mention of that event; and, nevertheless, the author, a Jewish Christian sympathizer with Paul, makes Benjamin relate the whole history of Christ, his rejection by the Jewish people, and the first destruction of Jerusalem. Under that pseudo-epigraphic form which he adopted, he seeks to win over his compatriots to the Christian faith. In that work the Messiah is designated by the expressions: *Light of the World, Saviour, only Son, Lamb of God, God come in the flesh.* *The Spirit* is spoken of, which *gives witness to the Truth*, a fountain which bursts forth for *the life of all flesh*, etc.: all so many expressions borrowed from

[1] How can Hilgenfeld, in the face of such facts, make Papias the representative of a primitive Jewish-Christian and anti-Pauline canon, in opposition to Marcion, the representative of a Pauline canon (*der Kanon*, pp. 18-21)? That is no longer history, it is imagination.

[2] What has Volkmar to say in opposition to the proof given? The title of *bishop*, borne by Papias, would be the indication of a later period. But comp. *the angel of the church*, Apoc. i. 20, ii. 1, etc. And did not James and Simeon of Jerusalem bear the title of bishops? Will they bring them down, on that account, to 165?

the Johannine Gospel. If the writing dates, as the greater number of interpreters admit (Dorner, Vorstmann, M. Vernes himself), from the end of the first or the beginning of the second century, we have in it a fresh proof of the presence and of the influence of the fourth Gospel at that period. There remains a last witness, which is the transition, as it were, betwixt the external and internal data. That is the *appendix*, chap. xxi., particularly the two verses which form the conclusion. That chapter, without strictly constituting a part of the Gospel, which certainly ends with the passage xx. 30, 31, is none the less connected with the entire work by the closest bonds. The style is so similar to that of the rest of the work, that we can only ascribe this portion either to the author himself, or to one of those persons who had frequently heard him orally relate the scenes here described. Subsequent interpolations, such as those in chap. v. or viii., do not fail to betray themselves,—on the one hand, by their omission in a certain number of documents, translations, or manuscripts; on the other, by certain internal differences of substance and form. That appendix, on the contrary, is not wanting in any document; none of the Fathers mention its absence in contemporary or more ancient manuscripts. It must therefore have accompanied the Gospel from the time when it first appeared, and the date of its composition must consequently almost coincide with the date of the composition of the Gospel itself. That fragment dates, according to Keim, from the end of the second century; according to Krenkel, from the year 180. But what interest could have been felt at that period in the question treated in the second part of that chapter, that of the meaning to be given to those words of Jesus: "If I will that he tarry till I come" . . . ? It was towards the close of the apostle's life, or immediately after his death, that the meaning of those words could become for the church a subject of preoccupation and discussion. On seeing the aged apostle grow weaker, it would naturally be asked: What will happen, and what did the Lord in reality announce to him? Or else he had already breathed the last sigh, and the question was put: How is that death compatible with the promise which Jesus made to him? That was the moment when it was of importance to make known to the church the exact tenor of those mysterious words, of which

several among those who surrounded John had heard him speak. And if it is carefully considered, we shall understand that no one more than John himself was bound to provide that they should be reproduced in their true form, in order that they might not become an occasion of stumbling to any of his brethren. That chapter then bears its date in itself; shortly before or shortly after the death of John. We can only attribute the redaction of it to those in whose hands the Gospel had been placed by the author, and who probably, at his request, thus completed it at the moment of publication. The two last verses of the chapter are explained in the most natural way by such a supposition. The guardians of the work, the redactors of the last chapter, declare in these verses, 24, 25 ("*we know*," ver. 24), that "the disciple whom Jesus loved" is he who had related to them all these things, and who has himself drawn them up. Their expressions even lead us to conclude that he was still narrating them at that moment; and the difference between the present verb: *which testifieth*, and the past verb *wrote*, can only be naturally explained if these two verses have been drawn out and added between the time when the apostle had finished the composition of the Gospel and that in which his oral testimony came to an end, that is to say, the time of his death. The subscribers add *that they know* that his testimony is true. They had either themselves been the witnesses of the Lord's ministry, and could examine and attest the truth of the narrative, or else it is the personal knowledge which they possessed of the author and of his character which could not permit them to entertain any doubt as to his veracity. That second explanation is evidently the most probable. The first may perhaps be applicable to the person who alone speaks in ver. 25 ("and *I think*"). But that is not necessary. And it may be admitted that he only distinguishes himself from others because it is he who holds the pen in their name. Be that as it may, here is testimony which emanates from those very persons who surrounded and knew the author at the end of his career. Otherwise it would only be a fraud, either of the pseudo-John himself, who did not blush to furnish that testimony to himself as emanating from a foreign hand, or of some of his trusted friends, who lent themselves to that shameful imposition? In

both cases it is an accumulation of knavery which remains, I believe, without precedent, and without example in profane literature itself. Such is the extremity to which that criticism finds itself driven, which places the composition of our Gospel at any moment whatever subsequent to the death of John, even should that be at the beginning of the second century.[1]

Let us add, that if the fourth Gospel had not been composed till after the death of the apostle, only ten to twenty years after that event, it could not have been circulated throughout those countries of Asia Minor without the presbyters who had surrounded the apostle—the school of John, as it is styled—having raised doubts, and causing some protest to be heard. Polycarp was there, who nourished himself on the true narratives of John, who reproduced them before the people in public statements, as Irenæus reminds Florinus (see p. 43), who had, as well as himself, been present at these instructions. Now we know with what jealous care Polycarp watched over the maintenance of sound traditions, and what a horror he felt for Gnostic novelties. How should not he have raised his voice when, ten or twelve years after the death of the apostle whom he had intimately known, he saw a writing make its appearance which was attributed to him, regarding which the apostle had never spoken to him, and which bore a stamp absolutely different from that of the statements which he had heard proceed from his mouth, as well as from those of the Synoptic Gospels? We can understand how Keim, in face of those mountains accumulated on his path, should see himself reduced to have recourse to a desperate expedient for reopening the way, that of denying, cost what it will, the sojourn of the apostle in Asia Minor. Let it be at least acknowledged, that by such methods of procedure history no longer exists.

And herein lies the proof, viz., that with all the hypotheses which place the composition of the fourth Gospel in the second century, there remains nothing more to be done than to make an immense hetacomb of all the literature of that century.

[1] We have not spoken in this review either of the letter falsely ascribed to Barnabas, nor of the *Pastor* of Hermas, nor of the quotations which are to be met with in the writings of the Gnostics named *Ophites*. Let it be understood that it is not through forgetfulness, but because we can find nothing that is decisive in those writings.

For it rises as an entire whole to bear witness against such an anti-historic supposition. Besides the letter of Clement of Rome, already sacrificed, letters of Ignatius, spurious; letter of Polycarp, spurious; letter of Irenæus to Florinus, spurious. That is not all; let us go back to the New Testament: Epistle of John, spurious; Apocalypse, spurious; first of Peter, spurious (we do not speak of the other Catholic Epistles, of which account has been taken long ago); Epistle to the Hebrews, spurious; Pastoral Epistles, spurious; Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians, spurious. It seems that at that epoch all men capable of writing anything permanent were forgers, and that all trustworthy writers knew only how to compose books destined to sink into oblivion! Nothing further remains for us but to study the fourth possible position, that which all tradition assigns to the composition of our Gospel,—the last *decennia* of the first century, the close of the life of John.

IV.

80–100.—The Fathers.

That date is derived from these words of *Irenæus*: "Afterwards (after the composition of the three other Gospels) John, the disciple of the Lord, he who had also rested on his bosom, in his turn published the Gospel, whilst he dwelt at Ephesus in Asia;[1] for," adds that Father (ii. 22), "he dwelt with them (the presbyters of Asia) even to the time of Trajan." *Clement of Alexandria* in like manner said, in his *Hypotyposes*, in a passage preserved by Eusebius (vi. 14): "John, the last, observing that outward things were narrated in the Gospels . . . composed a spiritual Gospel." According to *Epiphanius* (*Hær.* ii. 12), John was ninety years of age when he composed that work. All these *data* lead us, then, to the date indicated. Lange and Wittichen think that one much earlier must be admitted. These words of our Gospel (v. 2): "*There is* (ἔστι) at Jerusalem, by the sheep-gate, a pool, which is called in the Hebrew tongue Bethesda," prove, according to the former, that Jerusalem was still standing at the period when the author wrote. Our Gospel would then be prior to the year

[1] *Adv. Hær.* iii. 1.

70. But to that verb in the present tense may be opposed others in the past, which, with equal right, would prove the opposite. Thus, xviii. 1: "He went over the brook Cedron, where *was* (ἦν) a garden;" xix. 41: "In the place where He was crucified *there was* (ἦν) a garden;" and specially xi. 18: "Now Bethany *was* (ἦν) nigh to Jerusalem." In reality, these two classes of passages prove nothing; for, independently of the possibility that the pool of Bethesda might still remain after the fall of Jerusalem, the present "*is*," in the former passage, might be suggested to the author by the vividness with which he places himself again in the midst of the scene which he is relating; and the past "*was*," in the other passages, might proceed from the considerable interval which separated the moment in which he wrote from that in which the event occurred.

According to Wittichen, the apostle never was in Asia. He must have written in Syria, between 70 and 80, in opposition to some Essenes who had become Christians. But that date, as well as the preceding, breaks down before the well-ascertained fact—as we have recognised—of the dissemination throughout the churches of our three Synoptic Gospels, which must have preceded the composition of the fourth Gospel. We must say, then, with Weizsäcker (p. 289): "On the one hand, the earliest use of our Gospel which we can establish proves that its composition is not subsequent to the end of the first century; and, on the other, its relation to the Synoptics does not allow us to give it a much earlier date than the former."

Two traits likewise harmonize with that date. The first is the use which the author makes of the term "*the Jews*," as synonymous with that of the adversaries of the Gospel. Such an expression implies the rupture between the church and the synagogue, as well as the accomplishment of God's judgment on Israel by the fall of Jerusalem. The second trait is less easy to discern; it is the latent polemic tendency which appears to have inspired the prologue. Keim, with good reason, dwells upon that indication. "It is certain," he says, "that the Gospel defends in an affirmative form the same truth which the Epistle supports under a negative one" (p. 141). How can we, indeed, believe that the same author, writing in his Gospel those words: "The Word was made

flesh," and in his Epistle these: "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God; and this is that spirit of antichrist" (iv. 3), had not in view in these two statements the negation of the same truth, taught under these two forms? Keim's error is merely in taking advantage of that indication to establish by such means a much more recent date than the end of the first century. Why should John not have written in such a way in the course of the last twenty years of the first century? Are we not acquainted with the statements of the Fathers concerning the doctrine taught at that period by Cerinthus? That heretic alleged[1] that Jesus had been merely a pious Jew; but that the true Christ was a heavenly being who had come and united Himself to him at his baptism, and who at a later date reascended to heaven before the Passion. It was through His knowledge and His strength that Jesus had taught such sublime truths and accomplished such mighty miracles. Keim admits with us that that doctrine was indeed the true object aimed at by the author of the first Epistle. Only he places Cerinthus from 100 to 120, after the death of the apostle. But the positive trait related by Polycarp (see p. 57), on the relation between John and Cerinthus, makes the latter the contemporary of the apostle. Moreover, the sect of the *Ophites*, which even Baur acknowledges to have been the most ancient form of Gnosticism,[2] must be dated from the last part of the first century; for the three great systems of Basilides, of Valentinus, and of Marcion, in the first part of the second, were only "the more developed forms" of that speculation. The Johannine writings could then have had it in view without that polemic relation, explicit or implicit, leading us to place them in the second century. By our sacred writings themselves we can prove the existence of Gnosticism in the first century. In the Apocalypse (ii. 24), certain teachers at Thyatira are designated as "not having known the depths of Satan as they speak." Is that not evidently the Gnostic pretension to fathom the abysses of evil in order to illumine them by the torch of a speculation

[1] Irenæus, iii. 11.

[2] The earliest Gnostic sects are, without dispute, those which do not derive their name from any ascertained founder. Such are the Ophites. *Das Chr. und die chr. K. der 3 ersten Jahrh.*, p. 192.

capable of making sin re-enter into the general and necessary order of the universe? What is that but the beginning of Gnosticism? We fix the composition of the Apocalypse about the year 95; but for our critical opponents, who place it in the year 68, that fact is much more decisive still.

The Epistle to the Colossians and the Pastoral Epistles prove, in like manner, for those who admit their authenticity, the existence of a sufficiently-developed Jewish-Christian Gnosis some years before the death of St. Paul, about 63. But it is especially the Epistles to the Corinthians (concerning whose authenticity every one is agreed) which compel us to carry the Gnostic assaults as far back as the period of Paul's ministry. St. Paul tells us, 1 Cor. xiii. 3, of inspired men who, in Christian assemblies, dared to utter such words as these: "*Jesus accursed!*" In xvi. 22, also, he dismisses them with this malediction: "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be accursed." To curse Jesus in Christian worship is an act which is only possible on one condition,—that, namely, of separating that man, that Jew Jesus, from the true Christ, the heavenly being who alone really deserves that title. If it were so, we must ascribe to the party which at Corinth said: "And I, of Christ" (i. 12), quite a different character from that which has been hitherto attributed to it. It was not a question simply, in that formula, of opposing Christ to His apostles; the opposition was between Christ and Jesus Himself, and such as we find it positively taught by Cerinthus; and we must on no account, therefore, despise the information furnished by Epiphanius, who says that the First Epistle to the Corinthians was written *against Cerinthus*. We can understand perfectly well how, from that point of view, there would logically result the utter uselessness of the resurrection of Jesus, and the denial of that fact by such a party (1 Cor. xv.). What will succeed in proving the chief importance of that tendency which was then making its first appearance in Greece, are those words of the apostle, 2 Cor. xi. 3 and 4: "I fear that, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve by his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ. For if he that cometh preacheth *another Jesus*, whom we have not preached, or if ye receive *another spirit*, which ye have not received, or *another gospel*, which ye

have not accepted, ye might well bear with him." It is generally supposed that that other Jesus, brought to Corinth by the new-comer, is the Judaizing Jesus contained in the forms of the Law. It was so amongst the Galatians, but no longer at Corinth. Is not a different *spirit* here spoken of from that which the Corinthians had received through the instrumentality of Paul? The question then was of a breath, an inspiration, an enthusiasm, a power which impels. Such could only be that impure spirit (1 Cor. xii.) which committed blasphemy in calling "Jesus accursed." Here, consequently, is a form of heresy which far surpassed that of the Judaizing Gospel; it is a Jesus already shaped after a Gnostic pattern. These events happened in 57 or 58; who shall say that the explicit polemics of 1st John, and the latent polemics of the fourth Gospel, are not in their proper place between 80 and 90?

When we calmly pause in presence of all those opinions which fix the composition of our Gospel in the second century, we are struck by the number and diversity of the devices which are necessarily called into action in order to explain that writing. Here its object is to translate the æons of Valentinus into Christian ideas, there to correct the *dualism* of Marcion. On the one hand, to adapt the *word* of Justin; on the other, to attribute to the Paraclete of Montanus a more sublime and more general import: here, definitively to deprive Easter of its Jewish elements; there, finally, to catholicize the church. What a diversity of motives! What a multiplicity of aims! What a complication of means, often rash and morally indefensible, sometimes contradictory, always far-fetched and artificial! How clear, on the contrary, does everything become, if we recognise that that Gospel, instead of being the result of all those heterogeneous tendencies, is the common soil on which they were born, and from which they have diverged on all sides by the exaggeration of one of the elements of the truth which they had borrowed from it, and with which they had each exclusively connected themselves! How much better does such an explanation correspond with the simple and serious majesty of that narrative, and with the sacred clearness of those pages! If all the writers of the second century, from Ignatius to Justin, and from Justin to Athenagoras, lived and wrote prostrate at the feet of the Word made

flesh, it is because the words of an apostle were there, unceasingly delivering over that theme which is unfathomable to the hearts of believers, to the meditation of thoughtful minds. If the Gnostics endeavoured to create a system capable of bringing the history of Jesus into the development of humanity, of the universe, of divinity itself, it is because that apostolic teaching had opened to Christian thought that new and immense horizon in revealing in the person of the Author of redemption the creative Word Himself, and in thus giving to the appearance of the Christ all its humanitarian and cosmical significance. All the intellectual and religious labour of the second century, especially in Asia Minor, presents itself to the historian who contemplates the facts calmly and without a critical or dogmatic interest, as the deliberate elaboration of materials bequeathed by the first century to the second, in the very writing with which we are occupied; and this imposing fact is perhaps the most eloquent witness of its true date.

Finally, does not the whole of that literature of the second century, and even of the first, whose spuriousness, in order to maintain its assertions, criticism is compelled unsparingly to decree, raise its voice against such a procedure? Does it not proclaim that nothing else is sought than to sweep away true history to make way for an imaginary one, constructed in accordance with *à priori* critical and dogmatic views? Does it not demand justice from the tribunal of a true and impartial science? does it not appeal to *Philip sober?* We have already recorded many of the significant individual retractations on the subject of that Gospel. We look for a collective one which will embrace them all; when criticism, which is at present, as it were, intoxicated by the acquisition of its complete autonomy, shall have recovered its sober senses.

CHAPTER II.

THE AUTHOR.

In this chapter we approach the central, and certainly the most important, question. For it is in vain that we seek to persuade ourselves that our Gospel remains what it is,

whoever its author may be. "Its beauty, its edifying virtue, its holiness, the pleasant tone of many of its passages, worthy of having issued from the mouth of Jesus . . . all that," Keim alleges, "does not depend upon a name, as those think who dishonour what is holy when such a name is wanting." We are convinced, on the contrary, that it is of supreme importance for the church to know whether it is the Apostle John, or else some other thinker of the church of Asia, who puts into the mouth of Jesus the discourses contained in our Gospel, and who sketches the picture of His person and ministry which is preserved in it. And even those who deny the importance of that question, bear witness to it by the vigour and persistence with which they assail it.

I.

We must, above all, interrogate *tradition.*

It expresses itself in a decisive manner in the title of our Gospel: *according to John.* We have elsewhere[1] shown that that preposition, "*according to,*" refers, in the four titles of our Gospels, not to a form of conception prior to the redaction, but to the fact of the redaction itself. Now the title of our fourth Gospel, such as we possess it, is not wanting in any Greek document and in any version. It expresses, then, not the opinion of one or another amongst the Fathers, of one or another amongst the churches, but the unanimous feeling of all that was called Christian in the second century of the church. Like the titles of the three first Gospels, it was placed at the beginning of ours at the time when the evangelical collection was formed,—that is to say, at the latest, in the first half of the second century, as appears from several facts stated in the preceding chapter, and especially from the public reading of these four books, attested by Justin before 150. That general and collective testimony is the basis on which must be placed the special testimonies which we are about to recall. These latter are merely like the projecting peaks of a chain of mountains, the continuous base of which would be represented by the feeling of the whole church. We shall not go back to the statements of *Tertullian,* of *Clement* of

[1] *Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke,* vol. i. pp. 63, 64, 2d ed.

Alexandria, and of *Irenæus*, who do not entertain the slightest doubt concerning the Johannine composition of our Gospel. We begin with two witnesses, from 170 to 180. The first is that of Theophilus, whom we have already quoted (p. 200): "All the men animated by the Spirit, amongst whom John says." The second is comprised in the so-called *Fragment of Muratori*.[1] "In the fourth place, the book of the Gospel according to John. John, one of the disciples, exhorted by his fellow-disciples and by the bishops, said: 'Fast with me three days from to-day, and we shall relate what shall be revealed to each.' During that same night, it was revealed to Andrew, one of the apostles, that John should relate everything in his own name, all the rest superintending his narrative. And that is the reason why, although each of our evangelic books opens with a different beginning, that is of no moment for the faith of believers, since everything is set forth in all under the guidance of a single sovereign Spirit, as to the birth, the passion, the resurrection of Jesus, His conversations with His disciples, and His twofold advent. In fact, He appeared at first in humility and despised, that is the past; but a second time, glorious and with royal power, which advent is yet to come. What is there, then, surprising in this, that John has set forth in detail and with certainty those same things in his letters, saying, in reference to himself: That which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, and our hands have handled, write we unto you? Thus he declares himself in succession ear-witness, then eye-witness, finally, a redactor of all the miracles of the Lord." Hilgenfeld maintains that that quotation from the first Epistle has for its aim to confirm the composition of the Gospel by John, in the face of a portion of the church which still refused to admit it. It is impossible for us to discover the slightest trace of a polemic design in those lines. The only words where we might try to discover them: *What is there astonishing in that*, refer, as Hesse observes, not to the Gospel, but to the Epistle.

[1] See p. 203. For the date of the *Fragment of Muratori*, see the excellent work of Hesse on that document: *Das muratorische Fragment*, 1873. He places it (pp. 40–48) before the time of Irenæus (180). It is according to Hesse that the following passage is quoted.

Therein are contained, according to the opinion of most critics, the two earliest testimonies in which John is designated as the author of our Gospel (Keim, p. 156, and so many others). We by no means admit that way of looking at the matter. *Heracleon* and *Ptolemæus*, the two disciples of Valentinus, who had been in personal relation with that leader of the school, must, as we have seen, have written prior to that date. Now the first, in commenting on our Gospel, certainly attributed it to John. That is presupposed from beginning to end of the refutation by Origen. And the second, in his *Letter to Flora*, quoted our work in saying: "The *apostle* declares." He claimed, besides, according to Irenæus, to impute to *John* himself the Gnostic doctrine of the Ogdoad (see p. 206). We do not think we go too far back in fixing these two testimonies about 160.

Somewhat earlier, Justin tells us of the *Memoirs of the Apostles*, which are publicly read on the Lord's day in the assemblies of the church. "Those writings," he tells us, "are also called Gospels, and were composed by the apostles of Christ and the companions of His apostles." Whatever may be said, these expressions suppose the existence of four Gospels at least, two in each category. Now we have proved from a positive passage (p. 214) that John's Gospel formed a portion of that collection. It was therefore one of the two which he attributed to an apostle, since Mark and Luke, of which he likewise made use, both proceeded from companions of the apostles.

Marcion, about 140, attributed our Gospel to John, since it was on account of that very origin that he rejected it (p. 220 f.). *Papias*, from 110 to 120 at the latest, places the name of *John* in his enumeration of the apostles, not, as the Synoptics do in their apostolic catalogues, along with those of Peter and Andrew, but at the end of the list, with that of *Matthew*; which can only be explained by the intention of again bringing together the two evangelist apostles, and seems to imply in him the conviction of the Johannine origin of our Gospel.[1]

[1] We decline to avail ourselves here of any support from the annotation discovered by the Catholic theologian Aberle in a manuscript of the Vatican, and reproduced by Tischendorf (*Wann wurden*, etc.), where it is said: "The Gospel of John was published and given to the churches by John whilst yet alive, as

The most ancient testimony is and remains the declaration, comprised in the two concluding verses of chap. xxi. Even the editors of the Gospel, to whose hands the author had entrusted it, affirm, in publishing it, that that book was written by the disciple whom Jesus loved, and that they know him personally to be a man incapable of relating anything except the truth. It has been maintained that such an attestation necessarily presupposed the existence of persons who denied the authenticity of the work. But may a certificate, then, not be given without inferring from that an opposite affirmation? May that measure not be intended to give perfect security to those who would be afraid of being deceived, and consequently to have a purely preventive end in view? That testimony goes back, as we have seen, to the very period of John's death. There exists in the church of the second century one denial, only one; that of the anti-Montanist party mentioned by Irenæus, very probably the same as the *Alogi* of Epiphanius. But we have already recognised (p. 208) that, considered more closely, that contradiction is a homage rendered to the tradition of the Johannine origin of our Gospel. Zeller himself owns that "the motives on which that opposition rested were, as far as we know, derived from internal criticism:" which certainly proves that every support was wanting to them in tradition. And by themselves attributing the Gospel to Cerinthus, the contemporary of John at Ephesus, the Alogi brought, as it were, against their will, its composition into relation with the person of John.

In order to appreciate the full value of those facts, let us recall the completely traditional character of ecclesistical convictions at that period. They did not proceed by way of critical investigation. "That writing was not transmitted to us."[1] That being said, all was said. Transmitted or not

Papias, called the Hieropolitan, a beloved disciple of John, has related in his commentaries (*in exotericis*, read with Hilgenfeld: *exegeticis*), in the last five books. It was he who wrote that Gospel with exactness from John's dictation." As that manuscript belongs to the ninth century, we may admit, with Overbeck, that the last five books which are spoken of in that notice were an apocryphal appendix added subsequently to the work of Papias. Nevertheless, there remains something enigmatical in such an indication, especially as compared with that of Georges Hamartôlos, of which we have spoken (p. 62).

[1] It is thus that, towards the end of the second century, Serapion bishop of

transmitted, that was the motto of the Fathers and teachers of that period. Let us take into account, from this point of view, the difficulty of making penetrate into a *single* church, and the impossibility of making penetrate into *all*, without the least controversy, as the work of the Apostle John, a quite recent Gospel, and one so different from the preceding, which were already so universally received, and we shall appreciate the value of that unanimous agreement of the churches and teachers of the second century. Lechler has asked, with reason,[1] what would have happened in the Lutheran churches, if, thirty or fifty years after the death of Luther, an attempt had been made to introduce a totally new Confession of Augsburg, very different from the one which had been in circulation up till then. Can we imagine that such a fraudulent transaction could have been accomplished, without raising a single objection, and in perfect silence? It is a similar impossibility which we are asked to believe, in supposing that the Johannine Gospel, the work of any author whatever who passed himself off as the apostle, could obtain the universal assent which it enjoyed at the close of the second century. But it was not only the orthodox churches which recognised that work as apostolic. It was, as we have seen, the sects also, and those most distant from each other. The violent Judaizers of the party of the *Clementines*, the over-excited adherents of the Montanist mysticism, the speculative schools of Basilides and Valentinus, the Antinomian Marcionites, finally, the heathen Celsus,—all these opposite tendencies met together in one point; the acknowledgment of the fourth Gospel as an apostolic writing, and (with the exception of Marcion) adhesion to its teaching as that of indisputable oracles; they were the εἰρημένα, the "*it is said.*" Many even did violence to the texts in order to allegorize them, and endeavoured to derive conceptions from them which jarred with those of the Gospel. Would a work which was produced in the heart of the *great church* (an expression of Celsus), after all its branches were already severed from it, have permeated them with its

Antioch expressed himself on the subject of a false *Gospel of Peter*, which he had found in the church of Rhossus: τὰ τοιαῦτα οὐ παραλάβομεν ("that was not transmitted to us"), Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 12.

[1] *Studien und Kritiken*, 1856.

sap? And, on the other hand, had it been the work of some one of those sects already detached, could it have succeeded in establishing its authority over all the others, and over the church itself? The history can be explained only in admitting that our Gospel belonged to that common patrimony, to that apostolic heritage which preceded the rupture of the sects with the church.

II.

We pass on to the hearing of the second witness, *the Gospel* itself. What do we learn from it respecting its author?

The following is what Credner wrote before the cup of Tübingen had touched his lips:[1]—"If we possessed no historical data regarding the author of the fourth Gospel, we should none the less be led to a positive result by the data which the book itself supplies. The nature of the language, the brilliancy and dramatic vivacity of the narrative, the accuracy and precision of the information, the peculiar manner in which the forerunner and the sons of Zebedee are spoken of, the love, the fervid tenderness of the author for the person of Jesus, the irresistible charm shed over the Gospel history presented from that ideal point of view, the philosophical reflections with which that Gospel begins,—all that leads us to the following result: the author of that work could only be a man born in Palestine, only an eye-witness of the ministry of Jesus, only an apostle like the well-beloved apostle, could only be that John whom Jesus had chained to His person by the celestial charm of His teaching, that John who had reposed on His bosom, who had remained near the cross, and who, during his sojourn in a town like Ephesus, had not merely felt himself attracted by philosophical speculation, but had prepared himself to keep his place in the midst of those Greeks distinguished for their literary culture." Let us follow the progress of that line of argumentation; and, setting out from the periphery, let us draw near to the centre by degrees.

The author is a *Jew* by birth. That is proved by his style, which, as we have seen (p. 188 ff.), is marked by the most

[1] *Einleitung*, sec. 93.

minute peculiarities of the Hebrew language, even when, properly speaking, he is not *Hebraizing*.

That also is proved by the Messianic testimonies which he puts into the mouth of Jesus, and all of which have their starting-point in some one of the facts or theocratic types (p. 172). His religious conscience is so profoundly Jewish, that one of the predominant ideas of his exposition is, as Weizsäcker says, the rejection of Jesus by the Jewish nation, and the explanation of that fact. The starting-point of that history of Jesus is the acknowledgment of His title of Christ by the first disciples. It is that quality of Messiah which is constantly the question in His discussions with the Jews; and although in the end (xx. 30 and 31) that title is eclipsed by the superior title of Son of God, still even then it is not neglected. A Jew alone, who amid the foreign surroundings in which he dwelt had preserved "the inheritance of his youth" (Weizsäcker), could narrate in such a manner.

That Jew was of *Palestinian* origin. That is demonstrated by the exact acquaintance with the customs, circumstances, and localities of Palestine, of which his whole work gives evidence. That is more especially shown by his knowledge of the Hebrew tongue, which was almost entirely unknown to the Jews domiciled abroad. M. Renan has done justice to the use of all the Hebrew names, such as *Bethesda*, *Enon*, *Cedron*, and to the translation of the name of Siloam (Σιλωάμ). In reference to the corrections of the translation of the LXX. according to the Hebrew text, in the few quotations from the Old Testament which our Gospel brings forward, it is difficult to arrive at a certain result.[1] Nevertheless, it appears to me that when in xii. 40 the author quotes Isa. vi. 10, attributing the fact of the blindness of the Jews to the prophet or to God, precisely like Esaias ("He hath blinded their eyes"), whilst the LXX. attribute it to the people themselves ("their heart was hardened; they have shut their eyes"), the probability is in favour of the direct use of the Hebrew text by the evangelist. It is the

[1] See the remarks of Mangold (3d ed. of Bleek's *Introduction*, p. 211). It is with good reason that that critic challenges the necessity of the use of the Hebrew text for the quotation of Ps. xli. 10 in John xiii. 18.

same in the quotation from Zech. xii. 10, which occurs in xix. 37, "They shall look on Him whom they pierced;" that quotation is also in conformity with the Hebrew text, and differs entirely from the meaning given by the LXX. It is objected that the author perhaps quotes from Rev. i. 7, where that prophecy is in like manner recalled, but is here given with amplifications. It is improbable, then, that that is the source of that shorter form, a perfect imitation of the Hebrew text which we find in the Gospel.

That Jew of Palestine was a *witness*, and a *believing* witness, of the ministry of Jesus. That appears from the autobiographical character which we have demonstrated in the narrative from the one end to the other, which more particularly determines the starting-point and the limit, and which alone could decide that selection of facts and discourses which we have recognised in it. This appears more indisputably still from the first Epistle (i. 1–4), where the author declares himself a witness by all his senses (eyes, ears, hands) of the appearance of Christ, and contrasts himself as such with all those believers who have attained to the possession of that divine gift only through the medium of his testimony, and that of other witnesses such as himself. "That which we have seen, heard, our hands have handled . . . write we unto you, that ye may have fellowship with us."

That witness, that believer, is an *apostle*. He introduces us into the inmost circle of the Twelve in a way that the Synoptic narratives do not. He initiates us into the peculiar relations which Jesus maintained with each one of them, and especially loves to recall the striking words in which their characters or secret thoughts disclose themselves; for instance, the first interviews of Jesus with Andrew and his anonymous companion, then with Simon and Philip; the words of Philip to Nathanael, the conversation of the latter with Jesus, and his cry of adoration, i. 38–50; the discourse of Jesus with the apostles returning from Sichem, iv. 31–38; His question, full of graciousness, to Philip, and the frank and artless reply of the latter, vi. 5–7; the intervention of Andrew, vv. 8, 9; the stern warning given to Judas at the close of that same chapter, ver. 70; the simple question of the disciples on the occasion of the man who was born blind, ix. 2; the cry of

devotion, but at the same time of unbelief, of Thomas, xi. 16; the mediation of Andrew and of Philip on the occasion of the request of the Greeks, xii. 21, 22; the characteristic *rôles* of the different apostles on the last evening (Peter, xiii. 6–9; John, vv. 23–25; Judas, vv. 27–30; Thomas, xiv. 5; Philip, ver. 8; Jude, ver. 22); the firm conviction at which they all arrive, xvi. 17, 18, and 29, 30; the part of one of them as the introducer of Peter into the palace of the high priest, xviii. 16; the difference between Peter and his companion on their visit to the sepulchre, xx. 3–8; finally, the incredulous exclamation of Thomas, then that cry of adoration, by which he suddenly leaves behind him all those who up to that time had surpassed him, xx. 28. In presence of details like these, we must indeed admit: either that we have to do with a daring charlatan, who makes sport of the persons and characters of the best known of the actors in the Gospel drama, and imagines himself at liberty to place them on the stage according to his own fancy; or else, if that supposition is morally impossible, we here possess the narrative of one of the nearest witnesses of those scenes, initiated into the most delicate shades of the relation of his fellow-disciples to the Lord, and of all that happened in the inmost recess of the apostolic circle. Weitzel has remarked[1] that the author designates the disciples, not by the name under which they were known in the church, according to the apostolic catalogues, but by that which they bore amongst friends (Nathanael, for instance, chap. i. and xxi., instead of Bartholomew); and that he thus writes as if the thought did not occur to him that all those persons might be greater strangers to others than to himself. Let us further remark that Greek name *Didymus* (twin-translation of the name of Thomas), which is recalled thrice (xi. 16, xx. 24, and xxi. 2), as if it were a question of a personal reminiscence very dear to the heart of the author.

M. Renan has likewise brought forward that multitude of little details which imprint on the narrative the inimitable stamp of reality. "It was the tenth hour;" "it was winter;" "it was night;" "that servant's name was Malchus;" "they had made a fire of coals, for it was cold;" "the coat was with-

[1] *Studien und Kritiken*, 1849.

out seam," etc. etc. "So many precise traits," says that author, "which we can perfectly understand if we see in them the recollections of an old man of wondrous freshness;" but, we shall add, which become repulsive, and end by inspiring disgust, in a narrative of so serious a nature, if they are merely fictitious traits, intended to conceal the figure of the novel-writer under the mask of the historian.

To this feature, so special in its nature, let us add the position which the author assumes in reference to the Synoptic narrative. As we have demonstrated, he completes it, he even criticises it, and corrects it on more points than one. That attitude reveals in the author the consciousness of an immediate acquaintance with the facts, and one superior to that of any narrator who might be around him. And should it be maintained that such is only the act of a forger, who modifies history according to his speculative theories, we ask if prudence alone ought not to have prevented him from thus placing himself in contradiction to the received tradition, and to the universally received writings which contained it? Only an apostle, an apostle certain of being recognised as such by the whole church, could reasonably have taken that supreme position in regard to the Synoptic tradition.

That apostle was *one of the sons of Zebedee.* Almost all the other members of the Apostolic College are named one time or another in the narrative; and the name of two amongst the three most particular friends of Jesus (according to the Synoptics), James and John, does not once appear in the whole of a narrative so cordial! How could such a circumstance be purely accidental? That silence extends even to what affects them personally in the closest manner—to the name and the person of their mother, for instance; she who is expressly named in the Synoptics as present at the crucifixion, is passed over in silence in John xix. 25. To that general indication is added one of a more special nature, but not less significant. In chap. xxi. 2, we find the enumeration of seven disciples who, at the instance of Peter, go a-fishing together. The three first are Peter, Thomas, and Nathanael; then follow the two sons of Zebedee; and finally, two disciples who are not designated by name, assuredly because they did not belong to the circle of the apostles. The two sons of Zebedee are then put

in the last place amongst the apostles. That is a singular arrangement; it contrasts in a striking manner with the order in which they are constantly placed in the Synoptics. There, as well as in the Acts, they are, along with Peter and Andrew, at the head of all the apostolic catalogues.[1] What are we to conclude from that? Did the author wish to depreciate the sons of Zebedee? But criticism justly maintains that one of the aims of our evangelist was to elevate John, who, in the course of tradition, had been too much thrown into the shade by Peter. Or was the author of the narrative himself one of the two brethren, and, being unable to place himself after mere disciples, had he at least put himself in the lowest rank amongst his colleagues? Combined with the silence of our Gospel concerning these two men, and those closely connected with them, that fact is in reality a signature.

That son of Zebedee is *the disciple whom Jesus loved*, and, in a word, *John himself!* From the close of the twenty-first chapter it appears, in fact, as we have already recognised, that the disciple whom Jesus loved was present at that scene; and as he could only be, as we have likewise proved, one of those two brethren, and as what is said of him cannot apply to James (p. 31), there is therefore only one conclusion to be drawn, and that is, that the author of the Gospel, the disciple whom Jesus loved, and the Apostle John, are only one and the same person. A shrewd observation by Credner brings us likewise to the same critical result. The fourth Gospel is the only one which, in speaking of the forerunner of Jesus, does not add to his name the title of *Baptist*. Why? Doubtless, because that distinctive epithet would have had the effect of drawing attention to another John than the latter, which the author, who was himself the other well-known John, wished to avoid. Or, if such an explanation be deemed to be too ingenious, we must at least grant that if the author did not attach to the name of the forerunner the surname of *Baptist*, which Josephus himself does not fail to give him,[2] he must have been one of those who were personally acquainted with the forerunner *before* history had attached that epithet to his name, which, becoming technical, became at a later period inseparable from it.

[1] Comp. also Mark xiii. 3.

[2] *Antiq.* xviii. 5. 2: Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου Βαπτιστοῦ.

In the same way as the lot, proceeding in the hands of Joshua from tribe to family, from family to household, from household to individual, ended by seizing on him whom Israel sought for, Achan; so also, in tracking the indications which reveal the truth, we have seen the circle of possibilities gradually contract, and, after having discovered in the author the Jew, then the native of Palestine, then the witness, and lastly the apostle and one of the sons of Zebedee, we see inscribed, in resplendent letters, in the blank left by the *incognito* in which the author secludes himself, one name, the only one possible, that which history had proclaimed—the name of John. Let us examine the *objections* which are raised against that historical and critical result.

III.

1. Baur has alleged that there is a multitude of errors relating to the topography of Palestine and to Israelitish customs in that narrative. That accusation is, at the present day, generally abandoned. "There is no reason," even Keim says (p. 133), "for believing in these alleged errors."

2. It is maintained that historical facts are altered in the interest of a dominant idea, and an appeal is taken from it to the Synoptics. We believe we have established the historical superiority of John's statements in every instance where they really differ from the Synoptic narrative. And the proof of that superiority, we have already seen, proceeds from the Synoptic narrative itself, which, closely studied, on each occasion renders homage to the Johannine statement.

3. Stress is laid on the timidity, full of embarrassment, with which the author, without daring to call himself John, tries to pass himself off as that apostle. But such reserve would be very strange in a writer bold enough to compose with a high hand a new Gospel history, to "overturn" all received tradition, in short, to put into the mouth of Jesus an entirely new conception of His person! How should his conscience suddenly become so sensitive that it would feel reluctant openly to take the name of John? We acknowledge that he has availed himself of all possible means to pass himself off as that person; and could he have resisted the temptation of

designating himself as such! From what motive? The forgers of that period boldly appended their pretended names. It was precisely on such a stratagem that their strength rested, and they took good care to leave to the acuteness of their readers the care of doing all the critical labour to which we have just devoted ourselves. John alone, then, could designate himself with that reserve which was, moreover, as we have seen, one of the features of his character. In entrusting his work to the hands of the leading men in the church, he was well aware that they would themselves find means to make the author publicly known; and, as regarded himself, a feeling of holy modesty, which we can easily understand, forbade him from inscribing his name by the side of that of a Being whom he regarded and adored as the Son of God.

4. But if he was so humble, why, it is asked, does he designate himself as "the disciple whom Jesus loved"? Weisse was the first to discover "a repulsive vainglory" in such a title. And all our critics vie with each other in reproducing that way of regarding it. Such an opinion betrays a singular ignorance of the true feeling which filled the heart of the man so specially honoured by the personal affection of his Master. John would not, could not, name himself; but he must give himself a designation, for his part could not be entirely left out in that history. Now, if Jesus had really made of him His particular friend, and had given him the place nearest His heart, must he not have felt his entire personality absorbed in that recollection—the most precious of his life? He did not perceive in himself any personal quality which might have obtained for him such a favour; what he only saw in that relation was the tender condescension of Him who had so gratuitously drawn him so closely to Him. Amongst all the beams of that glory, *full of grace and of truth* (i. 14), which had characterized the truly human existence of the Word *made flesh*, it was that which had directly reached him. The Son of God was man; as such also in this respect, that He wished to possess *a friend*, and that friend He had chosen in his person. To revive that unequalled remembrance was not pride, but gratitude. It was not to raise a monument to his own glory, it was to give glory to the heart of Him who had thus stooped towards a being who was so inferior to Him. The supposition

that the author thereby wished to raise up in the sentiment of the church a rival to Peter, the representative of Jewish Christianity, is in contradiction with the whole of his Gospel, in which Peter plays a preponderant part, and especially with chap. xxi., where it is to Peter, and by no means to the "disciple whom He loved," that Jesus confides the direction of the apostolate and of the church.

5. It is maintained to be a psychological impossibility that any man, after having dwelt with Jesus for a long time as His equal, could come to consider Him as a Divine Being. But that difficulty exists for the whole apostolic church, whose characteristic, as we have seen, was *to call upon the name of the Lord.* The Apocalypse, which Baur and several of his successors attribute to John the apostle, makes no difficulty of teaching the divine pre-existence of Jesus, of calling Him *the First and the Last,* exactly as Isaiah designates Jehovah. The Epistle to the Hebrews, which, in spite of all the efforts of our critics, does not the less remain a document prior to the fall of Jerusalem,[1] in like manner, in the first chapter, identifies Jesus and Jehovah. And, nevertheless, that was the period when the generation contemporaneous with Jesus was still alive. The difficulty suggested proves, therefore, much rather the reality of the divine manifestations which signalized the life of Jesus, and especially that of the testimonies which He Himself rendered to His higher nature.

6. We have already discussed the Judaizing tendency attributed by the Tübingen critics to the Apostle John, and its incompatibility with the lofty spiritualism of the author of our Gospel. We think we have proved, and that by the very passage from which the Tübingen School deduces that great fiction (Gal. ii.),[2] that the Christianity of the Twelve, as well as that of Paul, rests on a common doctrinal basis, all the elements of which are included in the Synoptics, and already formed a portion of the teaching of Jesus. In reality, of the contradiction pointed out between Paul and the

[1] See Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften N. T.*, sec. 54.

[2] Even Scholten himself, at the close of his work on the sojourn of John in Asia Minor, admits, in his polemic against Hilgenfeld, that John in Gal. ii. does not appear as the opponent of Paul and of his missions (so that he might be, in his opinion, the author of the Apocalypse).

Twelve, there remains only a difference of *practice* in regard to the observation of the prescriptions of the law (pp. 39, 40).

7. Let us come to the true objection. The philosophical culture of the author of our Gospel is said to be incompatible with the antecedents of the former Galilean fisherman. But on what foundation is that alleged philosophical culture based? If the discourses of Jesus are not pure fictions,—and that, we think, we have established,—the idea of the Lord's pre-existence might easily be for the author the result of those very discourses. He had no need of lofty speculations in order to come to regard under that elevated light the person of his Master. The term which he employs to express that notion, that of the Logos, is the only thing which can be definitely alleged in support of this view. Was there any need to make of him the disciple of Philo, in order to explain that expression? We have already seen that there is nothing in this (p. 173 ff.). Not only did Philo not establish any relation between the person of the Logos and that of the Messiah, but John found amongst the Palestinian authors of the Targums the designation, purely biblical in origin, which he required to designate the Divine Being whom he had recognised in the person of Jesus: that of *Memra* (*Logos*, Word). If these teachers thus designated all the manifestations of Jehovah in the sensible world, it was a very simple process to apply such a term to the supreme manifestation of God on the earth, to the personal appearance of the revealing principle. So natural an application we find in the Apocalypse itself,—that book which our critics place even before the fall of Jerusalem, and whose author does not certainly betray any especial philosophical culture. Jesus is styled in it (xix. 13) the *Logos of God*. If John composed his Gospel towards the close of his life in Asia Minor, how should not the use of that term, the literal translation of what had become familiar to him in Palestine, be still more easily justified! In the midst of those amongst whom the idea of the Logos of Philo had probably already extended,[1] the apostle might precisely be desirous of using that expression to recall those minds given up to useless speculations from the purely rationalistic heights on which they were moving, and to fix their attention on the con-

[1] Comp. the arrival of the *Alexandrian* Apollos at Ephesus (Acts xviii.).

crete realities of the Gospel history. "That divine Logos, concerning which you speculate, we are acquainted with it; we have seen, heard, touched it. It has appeared on the earth; it has lived a perfectly real human life. We have seen His glory, a glory worthy of His origin, and we can bear witness to it. Believe in that Jesus whom we preach to you, and you will possess in yourselves the divine Logos."[1] We do not see that there was any incompatibility between such a use of the term Logos, and the pen of the fisherman John, brought up in the synagogue, formed in the school of Jesus' teaching, and in personal contact with Him, and living in an atmosphere saturated with Oriental and Alexandrian speculations.

8. Bretschneider had already tried to deduce, from the Easter controversy which arose in the second century, an argument against the composition of our Gospel by the Apostle John. That argument was reproduced by Baur, and henceforth presented, if we take a correct view of the state of matters in the criticism of the present day, under three somewhat different aspects.

Baur himself has, above all, dwelt on the question of the day of the Passover. According to the positive testimony of Polycrates, in his letter to Victor, written in the name of the churches of Asia about 190, the custom of those churches to celebrate the holy Paschal Supper on the evening of the 14th Nisan, whatever might be the day of the week on which that date fell, went back to the time of the Apostle John.[2] But the fourth Gospel precisely condemned that Asiatic or *quarto-deciman* usage (so it has been designated from the earliest times); for, far from fixing the institution of the Holy Supper on the evening of the 14th, as the Synoptics do, that work intentionally displaces the last meal of Christ, to carry it back, with the institution of the Holy Supper, to the evening of the 13th. Our Gospel, then, is in positive contradiction with the well-authenticated practice of the Apostle John, and

[1] Comp. Neander, *Pflanzung der Christliche Kirche.*

[2] He writes as follows (Eusebius, v. 24): "We celebrate the true day. . . . For some illustrious persons who are to rise at the coming of Christ are fallen asleep in Asia. Philip, one amongst the twelve apostles, who is buried at Hierapolis . . . then John, who rested on the bosom of the Lord . . . then Polycarp . . . Thraseas . . . Sagaris . . . all those celebrated the 14th, the day according to the Gospel." . . .

cannot be his work. But if even, which we do not believe, there had been ground for giving to the Synoptic narrative a meaning opposed to the statements of John, and to prefer historically the first to the second, it would always remain very improbable[1] that in Asia they would have selected for the celebration of the holy Paschal Supper the 14th Nisan, *as being the day on which that ceremony was instituted by the Lord.* Because, as we have already observed, that which is celebrated in the fulfilment of a rite is not the very institution of the rite, it is the event which the rite is intended to recall; and consequently the day chosen for the celebration is, as far as possible, that of the event, not that of the institution. And if it were so in the case before us, the Quartodeciman (Asiatic) rite is found to be in perfect harmony with the Johannine narrative; for the latter precisely fixes the event to which the ceremony of the Holy Supper refers, the death of Jesus, to the 14th Nisan. The churches of Asia fasted during the whole day of the 14th, thus associating themselves with the sufferings of the Redeemer; and, the evening being come, when the feeling of the salvation now consummated filled the souls of believers with joy, they celebrated the sacrament of the Eucharist, a word which signifies *thanksgiving.*[2] Nevertheless, objections sufficiently serious have been raised against such an explanation of the Asiatic rite. As it is on the evening of the 14th that the Jews celebrate the Paschal feast, it has been asked whether the rite of the church of Asia was not merely the Israelitish festival transplanted into the Christian church, but freed from everything which constituted the meal a specially Jewish one, the eating of the lamb, in particular. Many declarations of the Fathers seem to confirm that way of looking at it. Thus Polycrates expressly says, in his letter to Victor: "My ancestors have always kept *the day when the people* (of Israel) removed the leaven." Eusebius attributes the same meaning to the Quartodeciman rite. In the *Life of Constantine*

[1] Compare the demonstration already given, pp. 255, 256.

[2] Compare, in support of that explanation, the works of Weitzel and Steitz on the question. In the first edition of this *Commentary* we gave our adhesion to that manner of viewing it, which we are of opinion is not yet altogether overturned.

(iii. 5, 1) he characterizes the Asiatic mode in these terms: "To follow the Jewish custom." But if such is really the origin of the observance of the 14th by the churches of Asia, the argument derived from that date against the Johannine composition of our Gospel none the less falls for ever to the ground. For there is no longer any relation between the observance of the 14th by the churches of Asia, and the chronology of the narrative of the Passion.[1] The celebration of that day arose only from the important position which the Old Testament assigned to it in the Israelitish ceremonial.

We do not here go back on the point which we believe we have established against Baur in the chapter on the *date* of the composition of our Gospel; and that is, that the use made of that work by the Fathers and by the heretics during the entire course of the second century, proves that it was in existence *long before* the bursting out of the Paschal controversy in 160; a circumstance which does not permit us to imagine that it could have been composed with the view of exercising an influence on the solution of that great controversy.

Hilgenfeld, who places its composition a long while prior to the time fixed by Baur, has given to the argument derived from the Paschal controversy a more general turn. In his opinion, the proof of the spuriousness of that work specially results from the contrast between the Judaic character of the Quartodeciman rite introduced by John into Asia, and the highly spiritualistic tone of the fourth Gospel. According to that scholar, the evangelist's object was, in his account of the Passion, to free the Paschal rite from all connection with the Jewish Passover, and thus to pave the way for the introduction of the Western rite into Asia. It is on that account that he composed a narrative according to which Jesus no longer celebrated the Passover that year with the Jewish nation, and instituted the Holy Supper at a quite ordinary meal on the evening of the 13th.[2]—But by such a narrative the false John would yet have gained nothing in support of

[1] This has been shown in a particularly convincing manner by Schürer, *Zeitschr. für histor. Theol.* 1870.

[2] *Einleitung*, p. 404: "John laboured in Asia in quite another sense than Paul: he introduced the Judæo-Christian observance of the 14th Nisan." According to Paul's principles, there did not at first exist any τηρεῖν (any celebration whatever) in Asia; John there introduced the Judæo-Christian celebration

that Roman rite, the triumph of which he wished to obtain. He must have introduced into his narrative some special trait favourable to that rite,—for instance, the making the institution of the Holy Supper coincide with the appearance of Jesus to the disciples on the Sunday of the resurrection, or any other expedient suggested by his inventive spirit, which a too fastidious conscience did not prevent. But he has not done so, a proof that he did not dream of attaining that end. Moreover, all that explanation falls to the ground with the hypothesis of the legal Jewish Christianity of John, which we have refuted. Does not Scholten himself now admit, against Hilgenfeld, that John was not the adversary of Paul or of his missions?—that if he did introduce into Asia a Paschal feast corresponding in date with the day of the Israelitish Paschal festival, we could not find in that an anti-Pauline trait. For it is evident from Acts xx. 6 ("After the days of unleavened bread, we sailed away to Philippi"), and probably also from 1 Cor. v. 6–8, that Paul respected the great Jewish feasts in the very heart of those churches which he had founded amongst the Gentiles. And certainly that could be done without importing any legal tendency into that manner of acting. All depended here, not on the day, but on the spirit.

Scholten has tried to give to the argument derived from the Passover controversy a new direction. In his opinion, our evangelist wished to bring about, not the predominance of the Roman rite over the Asiatic, but the suppression of every rite, of any feast whatever, in the church. That thought, expressed by Paul in his Epistles,[1] the author of our Gospel sought to make paramount in relation to the Paschal feast, by keeping perfect silence in regard to that feast and the institution of the Holy Supper. But, first of all, because Paul rejected the legal observance of the ancient Jewish feasts, it does not follow, as we have just seen, that he absolutely rejected the selection of certain days as days of Christian festivals,—for instance, the establishment of a day of worship instead of the

of the 14th. At a later period, between 115 and 125, there arose at Rome, where no festival had existed, the celebration of Good Friday as the day of mourning (by fasting), and of the Sunday of the resurrection as the day of joy (by the Holy Supper); and that is the rite which the fourth Gospel tried to introduce into Asia, instead of the Judæo-Christian observance of the 14th (p. 736).

[1] Gal. iv. 10; Col. ii. 16; Rom. xiv. 5.

Jewish Sabbath; compare 1 Cor. xvi. 2 with Acts xx. 7. Then, how are we to imagine that the author of our Gospel could expect to obtain such a revolution from the church simply by means of silence? Long before, at the alleged date of the composition, the Sunday had been established, and everywhere celebrated as the *Lord's day*.[1] And yet he did not know how to put into the mouth of the Lord, although he had made Him say so many things which He never uttered, some emphatic and very decided warnings against outward festivals in general! Much more, he spoke to Nicodemus of the *baptism of water* as a condition of entrance into the kingdom of heaven (John iii. 5). He then expressly returned to that ceremony, ascribing it not only to John the Baptist, but to Jesus and His apostles (iii. 22, iv. 1, 2)!

Thus we see how, under these different forms, that weapon is broken to pieces in the hands of those who make use of it; and we can easily foresee that very soon negative criticism will end by abandoning it altogether.[2]

[1] Apoc. i. 10; Justin, 1st Apology.

[2] The opinions of the critics of the present day may be divided into five classes: 1st. The opinion of Baur, Zeller, Hilgenfeld, according to whom our Gospel is in contradiction with the Asiatic rite, which proceeds from the Apostle John. 2d. That of Hengstenberg, Wieseler, Tholuck, Hofmann, etc., who interpret the narrative of the fourth Gospel in such a way that it, as well as the Synoptics, fixes the death of Christ on the 15th Nisan; it would thus be found to be in harmony with the Asiatic rite, supposing that the latter was decided by the idea that the Holy Supper was instituted on the evening of the 14th. 3d. The opinion of Weitzel, Steitz, Ritschl, Thiersch, Weizsäcker, Meyer, etc., which we have ourselves supported in the first edition of this *Commentary*, that the Asiatic rite is in harmony with the fourth Gospel, in so far as the latter places the death of Christ on the 14th Nisan. 4th. The opinion of Lücke, Gieseler, Bleek, de Wette, Luthardt, learnedly supported of late by Schürer, according to whom the Asiatic rite has no relation with the question of the day of the death of Christ, but arises simply from the Israelitish feast of the Paschal meal. 5th. The opinion of Scholten, according to whom the Johannine narrative would be a Pauline protestation against all Christian feasts in general. We do not here consider the question of the position of Apollinaris in reference to the Asiatic rite. Did he oppose it, in conjunction with Clement of Alexandria, or else did they both oppose a Judaizing party who kept the Passover on the 14th, like the churches of Asia, but after the manner of the Jews, *more Judaïco*, as Origen says of certain Jewish-Christians, that is to say, doubtless, with the lamb and unleavened bread? No light seems to us to be thrown upon the question, and it is in any case foreign to that which is under consideration, since Apollinaris, as well as his opponents whoever they might be, admit the authority, and consequently the authenticity, of our Gospel.

9. The last difficulty is that which arises from the differences between the Gospel and the *Apocalypse*. That book, it is said, is the one which possesses the most ancient and most solid testimonies in its favour. It is therefore right to acknowledge it as Johannine. Now, in respect of style as well as ideas, it differs so far from the fourth Gospel, that the two writings cannot be attributed to the same author. And since the Apocalypse is the best attested of the two, the Gospel is condemned. Such is the reasoning of Baur, of Hilgenfeld, etc. That argument has no weight with Keim, Scholten, and all those who at the present day reject the Johannine origin of the Apocalypse as well as that of the Gospel.

Let us observe, in the first place, that it is a mistake to regard the Apocalypse as having earlier and more solid testimonies in its favour than the Gospel. Justin, from whom proceeds the earliest testimony in favour of the first of these books, does not accord less authority to the other, since he places it amongst the Memoirs of the Apostles, publicly read in the churches of his time, and himself quotes it a considerable number of times. Papias, who was so attached to the millenarianism of the Apocalypse, at the same time took his stand on passages from the first Epistle of John, and, as we have seen, drew his evangelical intuitions from the fourth Gospel, no less than from the Synoptics. The testimonies in favour of the Gospel are, then, of equal value with those which may be quoted in favour of the Apocalypse; so that, if really we had to choose between them, as regards the Johannine authorship, the choice would be perfectly free, and we should preserve intact the right of deciding in favour of that one of the two writings which presents the most convincing internal proofs of authenticity.

But is the dilemma obligatory, and the choice necessary? The most powerful reason in favour of the incompatibility of the two writings having the same origin, is that which is derived from *difference of style*. In the Apocalypse the language is strongly Aramaizing; decided solecisms betray an author who does not yet know how to write Greek correctly; in short, the absence of those profound and abstract terms, such as *light, life, world, death*, taken in a spiritual sense, which characterize the Gospel, reveals quite a different pen. Then, what a con-

trast between the calm and clear language of the Gospel, and the abrupt, colliding, and, in some degree, torrent-like style of the Apocalypse! But is it not strange that by the side of these alleged solecisms are to be found at every instance, and often in the same verse, the correct grammatical turn of which the author is thought to be ignorant? If it is through ignorance of the language that he errs against the Grammar or the Syntax, how is it that he corrects himself in the following sentence?[1] We need not here speak of involuntary barbarisms, but of intentional irregularities, designed to bring certain notions into prominence; for instance, the immutability of God in the strange construction of i. 4. The appositions to the nominative of a substantive, to the genitive or the dative, may be explained in a similar manner; the point in question is to place the accessory idea, in all its independence, in relation to the principal word. Irregularities quite similar are to be met with in the Gospel; thus the absolute nominatives in vi. 39, xvii. 2.

The omission of certain abstract terms, favourites of the evangelist, belongs to the nature of the Apocalypse, which, in so far as it consists of visions presented under the form of pictures, admits only of terms of a plastic nature. We do not the less find corresponding expressions in the two writings. There, where the Gospel says *life* (ζωή), the Apocalypse says *living fountains of water, or of living water* (ἐπὶ ζωῆς πηγὰς ὑδάτων), vii. 17, (ὕδωρ ζωῆς), xxii. 17; there, where the Gospel merely says that Christ is the *light* (φῶς), the Apocalypse designates the lamb as the torch of the holy city (ὁ λύχνος αὐτῆς), xxi. 23. Instead of the term "*world*," the Apocalypse says *the Gentiles*, because in the struggle which constitutes the object of that vision these are the heathen, which represent, in a concrete manner, the worldly principle. The expression, "the *second death*," is in the Apocalypse quite the equivalent of the simple word "*death*," in those cases where it is taken by the evangelist in its most solemn sense. In reference to the Aramaisms of the style, they naturally

[1] i. 4, he writes: ἀπὸ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος; ii. 20: τὴν γυναῖκα . . . λέγουσα; iii. 12: τῆς καινῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἡ καταβαίνουσα. But in i. 4 we likewise read: ἀπὸ τῶν ἑπτὰ πνευμάτων; i. 10: ὡς σάλπιγγος, λεγούσης; iii. 10: ἐκ τῆς ὥρας τοῦ πειρασμοῦ τῆς μελλούσης; and so throughout the whole book.

result from the constant influence of the prophetic pictures of the Old Testament upon those of the Apocalypse, which are their reproduction. Winer[1] has remarked how much more decidedly Aramaic is the style of Josephus when he relates the history of the Old Testament, than when he narrates the events which happened under his own eyes. It is so, because in the latter case he writes in a manner independent of any foreign model. Nierneyer has justly said,[2] that the entire absence of difference between the two Johannine writings, under conditions of redaction so different (supposing that both proceeded from the same author), would furnish reason for "legitimate astonishment."

In short, is it not with good reason that Luthardt, in order to explain the general contrast of the style, reminds us of the different manner in which the author laboured in each situation? On the one hand, the calm and collected reproduction of the most sacred recollections; on the other, the painful parturition of the most terrible or most brilliant pictures of the future. It is amid the repose of the mind in full possession of its object that he draws up the Gospel (*ἐν νοΐ*); it is in the most enthusiastic exaltation of Christian hope that the Apocalypse is composed (*ἐν πνεύματι*, i. 10).

And yet what a complete homogeneity between these two styles in the eyes of him who looks below the surface![3] We shall merely mention some features: the use common to both writings of the term "*to do*" (*ποιεῖν*), in the sense of speaking, *to speak a lie, to speak the truth;* of the term "*to walk*" (*περιπατεῖν*), to denote moral activity; of the expression, *to keep the word,* or *the commandments* (*ποιεῖν, τηρεῖν τὸν λόγον, τὰς ἐντολάς*); of the very characteristic term by which the identity of the real and of the ideal is designated, and which we translate by *genuine* (*ἀληθινός*); of the expressions, *to hunger, to thirst* (*διψᾷν, πεινᾷν*), to indicate the profound wants of the soul; of the term "*lamb,*" to designate the Christ, with this difference, that the Gospel says *ἀμνός*, which is appropriate to the victim burdened with the sin of the

[1] *Grammar,* 6th edition, p. 33 [E. T. p. 34].

[2] Report by Busken-Huet, *Theological Review,* September 1856.

[3] We recommend to our readers the study of Niermeyer on this subject (see p. 22).

world, whilst the Apocalypse employs the neuter term *ἀρνίον*, which signifies something stronger, and is better adapted as a pendant to the term *θηρίον*, by which is designated the Beast (the Antichrist) of the apocalyptic vision; the expression, *amen, amen*, which so frequently forms the commencement of the discourses of Jesus in the fourth Gospel, and which we find transformed into the name of Christ in the Apocalypse ("These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness," iii. 14); finally, the expression *Word*, or *Word of God*, common to the three Johannine writings, and which, in the whole of the New Testament, belongs to them alone (Gospel, i. 1; 1st Epistle, i. 1; Apoc. xix. 13), as if it should constitute an indissoluble bond between them, etc. If we would form an idea of the analogies of style between the Gospel and the Apocalypse, let us study, for instance, the apocalyptic vision (Apoc. vii. 15–17). In it are found reunited several of the characteristic expressions of the Johannine style in the Gospel: to *dwell* (under a tent), *σκηνοῦν ἐν*, Gos. i. 14; *to hunger, to thirst*, Gos. vi. 35; *the lamb*, Gos. i. 29; *to feed*, *ποιμαίνειν*, Gos. xxi. 16 (*ποιμήν*, Gos. x. 1–16); *to lead*, *ὁδηγεῖν*, Gos. xvi. 13. Add to these common features the rarity of particles, and particularly of *μέν*, so frequent in Greek authors; then the striking harmony between the two quotations from the same prophecy of Zechariah, Apoc. i. 7 and Gos. xix. 37, with a similar correction of the translation of the LXX., according to the Hebrew text,—and it will doubtless be admitted that these common elements establish the identity of authorship, whilst the differences indicated above correspond very naturally to the different situations in which that author composed his works.

But other more important differences are challenged,—differences in the manner of viewing things. The conception of God is not the same. In the Apocalypse, God is only anger avenging justice; in the Gospel, He is love. But it seems to be forgotten that this God of the Apocalypse, who is depicted to us as so terrible, is the Father who *shall wipe away all tears from our eyes*, and who *dwells with men* in that New Jerusalem, where He shall live with them as in a tabernacle (Apoc. vii. 17, xxi. 3); is not that loving enough? And, on the other hand, we do not the less forget that the *anger* of the God of

the Gospel *abideth* on him who believeth not the Son, and that *death* is the eternal lot of those who have the devil as their father, and reject the Son (iii. 36, viii. 24, 41); is not that severe enough? If, after that, a certain contrast still exists, that simply results from the fact that the Gospel describes the coming of God in Christ, not to *judge*, but to *save* (iii. 17); whilst the Apocalypse describes the coming of God in Christ to *judge* the world, after the work of mercy in reference to it has been accomplished, and fully presented to it (Gos. xix. 11, xx. 11–15).

It is also said: The conception of the person of Christ is different; in the Gospel He is *essentially* God, as the Son existing previous to His advent on the earth; in the Apocalypse He is only God *by communication*, and as the Messiah exalted to glory. But in the Apocalypse Jesus is styled the *beginning and the end, the first and the last;* now these are in Isaiah names given to Jehovah alone, and the Apocalypse applies them to God Himself, which implies His divine pre-existence. If, then, He is elsewhere called the *beginning of the creation of God*, ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, iii. 14, that term ἀρχή cannot mean: *the first created*, a being prior to all others, any more than the term: *the last*, can mean *the last comer*. That expression signifies *the beginning*, from which all creation emanates; as *the last* signifies the *end*, to which all creation tends and returns. Christ is the link by which the whole chain of created beings is connected with God, both in respect of their origin and their end. Such is precisely the idea of the Word in the prologue of the Gospel. This is what is expressed not less clearly by this name: *he that liveth*, ὁ ζῶν, which is given to Him in i. 18; comp. Gos. i. 4: "In Him was life," and v. 26. On the other hand, it is certain that the Apocalypse contains the idea of the *subordination* of the Messiah to Jehovah, i. 1: "The revelation of Jesus Christ, *which God gave unto Him*" (comp. vv. 4 and 5, and elsewhere). But the Gospel teaches precisely in the same way. Does not Jesus say, xvi. 28: "My Father is greater than I;" v. 26: "The Father hath *given* to the Son to have life in Himself"? The very terms *Word* and *Son* imply subordination.

The doctrine of *justification* is identical in the Gospel, in the Apocalypse, and in the first Epistle. Every one must

admit this. There is no longer any question of circumcision and legal works in the Apocalypse, any more than if they had never existed; justification is gratuitous, and acquired by faith. "Salvation comes down from the throne," as a completed work, a divine gift. The sanctification of believers is the fruit of faith; it is by faith that they keep the commandments, xxii. 9. That idea is figuratively expressed by this image: *washing their robes in the blood of the Lamb.*

Where, then, is the alleged Judæo-Christianity [1] of the Apocalypse to be found? We receive for answer: In the conception which is formed of the church and the kingdom of God. The earthly Jerusalem continues in the Apocalypse to be the centre of the kingdom of God; the Jews alone are its real citizens; heathen believers are only tolerated there, as strangers to whom they are quite willing to grant a place of sojourn; they constitute the *plebs* of the holy city. This is what Volkmar maintains. But have they eyes in order not to see? Does not the Jerusalem, which becomes the centre of the kingdom of God (xxi. 10), "*descend out of heaven from God*"? Is that the earthly Jerusalem? It is called "*the tabernacle of God with*" . . . with whom? the Jews? no, "*with men*," xxi. 3. Is there not here the purest universalism? And to leave no doubt respecting the perfect equality which exists amongst believers, Jews and heathens, the author adds: "And they shall be *His people*, and God Himself shall be *with them*, their God." Chapter vii. is brought forward, where 144,000 of Israel, marked with the seal of the living God, ver. 3, occupy, it is said, a superior position to the countless multitude of all nations, and kindreds, and people, mentioned in ver. 9. But these last stand before the throne of the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; the Lamb feeds them and leads them to living fountains of waters, and God wipes away all tears from their eyes. Is such a position really that of those who are merely tolerated, of a foreign *plebs*, without right of citizenship? I much rather suspect that these are the innumerable believers from all nations who, in chap. vii., find themselves placed far above the 144,000 Jews on whom is set the seal of God. To stamp

[1] That *earthy* Judæo-Christianity, as one of our modern French critics called it with proud disdain.

with a seal, is to indicate a right of property in the object sealed. Thus God merely keeps in reserve, as sacred property, those 144,000 Jews for the struggle which is at hand, and in which they will be called to play an important part. But for the time they are not even yet converted. It is only in chap. xiv. that we find them reunited as believers *around the Lamb* (vv. 1, 2). But even to suppose that the converted heathen are here represented as *added* to the believing Jews, is a view which would in no way differ from that of St. Paul, who, Rom. xi., represents the Gentiles as wild branches grafted in in room of the Jews, the natural branches, on the stock of the kingdom of God; it would differ in no way even from that of the author of the fourth Gospel, who, chap. x., represents the sheep taken from the Israelitish fold as the nucleus of the flock, and the sheep summoned from other folds as added to that primitive flock, ver. 16. Is it not evident that, from one end of the vision to the other, the author heartily sympathizes with the work of St. Paul amongst the Gentiles? Is it not that work which he exalts by all those descriptions, full of enthusiasm, of the faith of the Gentiles, some traits of which we have just recalled? The book breathes from end to end with the broadest Pauline universalism.

But, it is said, does not the author betray himself to be a sworn enemy of Paul? Is it not to that apostle that that expression in the epistle to the church of Ephesus refers: "Those who say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars" (ii. 2)? Is it not a condemnation of Paul's doctrine which is to be found in ii. 2: "Thou sufferest that woman Jezebel to seduce and to teach my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed to idols" (allusion to 1 Cor. viii.–x.)? More than that, the false prophet, who leadeth the whole earth to worship the Beast, that is to say, the Roman Emperor (xiii. 14 ff.), is that not Paul, who, Rom. xiii. 1, ordains Christians to be subject to the higher powers, by teaching that the powers that be are ordained of God?[1]—What? Are we to suppose that the author of the Apocalypse would have dared, in an epistle to the church of Ephesus, to apply to Paul, the founder of that

[1] It is to Volkmar that the honour of this discovery is due.

church, that expression: "Who pretendest to be an apostle, and art not, but thou hast been found to be a liar"! It is truly a case for answering, with Luthardt: He who says too much says nothing. When the author speaks of eating things sacrificed, the point in question is certainly not that eating, wholly pervaded by faith and Christian charity, which Paul authorizes in 1 Cor. viii.–x., but, as the close connection in which that eating is placed *with impurity*, that of the excesses to which certain members of the church gave themselves up, who, abused the principle of Christian liberty; like those who at Corinth said: *All things are lawful to me*, and who under such a pretext participated in the feasts celebrated in the idol temples, and abandoned themselves to all the impurities which were there practised. It is precisely those libertines whom Paul had opposed at Corinth, 1 Cor. vi. 1, 2, viii. 10, x. 7–11. The Apocalypse characterizes them, xxi. 27, "as the impure who work abomination and make a lie." And could Paul and his disciples be such? It is known that among many sects—amongst the Ophites, and in the school of Basilides, for instance—it was taught that it was allowable to eat of meats that had been sacrificed, in order to pass oneself off as a heathen in times of persecution. Was such, then, the eating of which St. Paul had spoken?—St. Paul would, in short, be the false prophet of the Apocalypse, the follower of the Beast and of Antichrist, and that by virtue of Rom. xiii. 1, 2. But the author of the Apocalypse himself marks out to the Christians with respect to the Beast exactly the same line of conduct as Paul in Rom. xiii. "He that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword," he says in xiii. 10, certainly alluding to the words by which Jesus had condemned the armed resistance of St. Peter to the Jewish and Roman authorities. And in order that there may be no doubt of the meaning of those words, he adds: "Here is the patience and the faith of the saints." What he asks, then, from the saints in case of persecution, is resignation in face of persecuting violence. The path marked out by the Apocalypse is, then, the same as that indicated by Paul, as that followed by Christ at the time of His apprehension in Gethsemane. And would Paul on that account be the false prophet! Whither does criticism stray to? It has been

alleged again that the Apocalypse designedly set Paul aside, when, in the description of the holy city, it says that the names of the twelve apostles were engraven on the twelve foundations of the wall; as if that number twelve were not commanded and required by the harmony of the picture, and did not belong to the symbolism, according to which the twelve tribes constantly represent the kingdom of God in its fulness. There remain the views of the Apocalypse concerning the end of the world. It Judaizes, it is said, for it proposes to Christian hope the reign of a thousand years. But Niermeyer remarks, that "the duration of the Messianic kingdom has never been fixed by the Jewish doctors." That number of a "thousand years" is therefore by no means an idea which has passed from the synagogue to the church; it went forth from the bosom of the latter. The Apocalypse, again, is reproached for speaking of a judgment according to works (xxi. 13: "And they were judged every man according to their works"). But John and Paul are with each other in doing this; John v. 29: "They that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation;" Rom. ii. 6: "Who will render to every man according to his deeds." Another Judaizing misdeed still: The Apocalypse teaches a *first resurrection of the just* (xx. 4–6). But Jesus does so likewise (Luke xiv. 14); Paul also (1 Cor. xv. 23), and perhaps the fourth Gospel also (v. 29 comp. with 24). It is objected further: The advent of Jesus in the Gospel is purely spiritual; in the Apocalypse it is an outward Parousia, and one attended with *great fracas*. (This is again an expression of one of our modern French critics.) But Paul also speaks clearly of a visible Parousia, accompanied by the resurrection of deceased believers, and by the transformation of believers who are alive, at the sound of the trumpet and the voice of the archangel (1 Thess. iv. 16; 1 Cor. xv. 52); and the author of the fourth Gospel himself speaks of the dead who at that moment shall come forth from their graves at the voice of the Son of God (v. 28). Quite a different advent from the advent in spirit, is implied in the words of Jesus, quoted xxi. 22: "If I will that he tarry till I come." On the other hand, the Apocalypse is very far from denying the return of Christ

in spirit, which precedes the external advent. "Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me;" words perfectly analogous to that promise in the Gospel (xiv. 23): "If a man love me, he will keep my word; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him."

The contrast between the two writings is, then, merely relative. It arises, not from a difference in the manner of looking at things, but from the opposition between the subjects which are treated in them. These two subjects refer to the same divine work: the substitution of the reign of God for that of Satan in humanity. But they mark out two different scenes in that divine drama; the one, the advent of the Redeemer, working out salvation here below; the other, that of the heavenly King, consummating the judgment. These two scenes do not occur on the same stage; the one takes place in the midst of the people of Israel, the other embraces the whole earth. The actors, although fundamentally identical, do not present themselves any longer under the same form. In both cases we again find Christ as the object of faith; faith as the hand which lays hold of Him, and unbelief as the hand which rejects Him. But in the Gospel the object of faith is the Christ in His state of humiliation,—faith has *the disciples* as its representatives, and unbelief plays its part in the person of *the Jews;* whilst in the Apocalypse the object of faith is the glorified Christ,—faith appears personified in the *church*, and *the Gentiles* are the representatives of unbelief. The second situation was *determined* by the facts as well as the first, and the same author could treat of them both. It was enough for him, in order to place himself in the first, to revive his recollections; to enter into the second, to open his eyes. There is nothing which obliges us, then, to ascribe one of the works to a heathen author, the enemy of Judaism, the other to a Jewish author embittered against the Gentiles. The phases of the struggle, although diverse, are in like manner analogous. In the Apocalypse as in the Gospel, from the very beginning the termination seems very near at hand; and yet the drama is prolonged in an unexpected manner. The refrain here is: "But the hour was not yet

come." There, at the end of the first six seals and of the first six trumpets, the presentiment of the impending end displays itself among the inhabitants of the earth, and nevertheless the progress of events begins again, and goes onwards to a new crisis. In both instances, also, there is a twofold simultaneous *progress:* on the one hand, the divine light shines with a vast increase of splendour,—there, amongst the Jews—here, amongst the Gentiles; on the other, owing to the growing obduracy of men, the darkness which covers the earth becomes more and more dense, and in the midst of it, by a final act of brutal violence, is to be consummated the close of the outward struggle. Finally, of the two sides, the cause of God, which has no other weapon than resignation, materially succumbs; there, in the person of Jesus; here, in that of the church. But of the two sides also, that defeat is suddenly transformed into a glorious victory; there, by the resurrection of Jesus; here, by His second advent and by the elevation of the bride to the throne. These two writings, then, both in regard of the subjects of which they treat and of the treatment itself, are like the two halves of a perfect whole. Thence we can easily explain both their harmonies and their contrasts; we can especially understand how all that relates to the first advent of the Lord is treated in the one, all that concerns the second described in the other.

To place these two works in opposition to each other, it is necessary, as Luthardt says, to materialize the one and spiritualize the other to an excessive degree. But what sort of criticism is that? It is no longer science; it is fiction. Criticism passes away, but the books remain. When Niermeyer, who admitted the inexplicable nature of the contrast between the tendency of the two writings, declared that "if the *earthly* Jerusalem could be removed from the apocalyptic picture, the whole book would become spiritualized by that alone;" or when Baur was not afraid to call the fourth Gospel "a spiritualized Apocalypse," they both rendered homage, without wishing to do so, to the truth which we lay down. We have shown that the idea of the earthly Jerusalem, as claiming to be the final Jerusalem, the centre of the kingdom of God, is in reality absent from the apocalyptic representation. The conclusion drawn by Niermeyer as a possible event assumes

then great force. And if it is absurd to suppose that a material city could have a wall *as high* as it is long and broad, so as to form a perfect cube of fifty leagues in its three dimensions;[1] if it is not less absurd to compare such a material structure to a bride adorned for her husband (xxi. 2); if it is self-evident that that symbolic form recalls that of the most holy place, and represents the sublime idea of the church as the spiritual abode of the thrice holy God; and if in this sense the comparison of that city to a bride adorned for her betrothed contains nothing which is not most reasonable,—it follows from that, that all the other images which depend on the first—the gates, the walls, the situation of the city, the river which waters it, and the trees which grow on the banks of that river, etc.—can only be understood spiritually; that the spiritualization of the Apocalypse is consequently the only legitimate interpretation of that book, and that, since the Gospel is only a "spiritualized Apocalypse," as Baur has affirmed, it is in reality identical in its substance with the Gospel. That is the point which we wish to establish.

After this lengthened examination, what remains of the difficulties, alleged to be insurmountable, collected by modern criticism against the Johannine origin of our Gospel? Certainly we do not complain of the energy of the attack, which only serves the better to demonstrate the firm basis of the defence. We regret only one thing in this great critical struggle, and it is this, that the dignity of science does not emerge from it entirely untouched, and that the gravity of the procedure has not always corresponded to that of the subject.

IV.

One final task remains to us, that of examining in our turn the value of the *hypothesis* which critics have endeavoured to substitute for the ancient tradition of the Johannine composition.

One proposes as its presumed author, *Apollos*, whom he at the same time considers as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews; that critic is Tobler. Another brings forward *the Presbyter John*, that contemporary of the apostle at Ephesus, to

[1] Twelve thousand furlongs, xxi. 16.

whom the well-known passage of Papias has introduced us; that critic is M. Nicolas. MM. Renan, Weizsäcker, and others decline to indicate any particular name, and are generally of opinion that it was *a member of the school of John* in Asia. Lützelberger presents as a candidate his *Samaritan* settled in Mesopotamia. Finally, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Scholten, Keim, their *great unknown Alexandrian philosopher*, a semi-Gnostic, "the most brilliant flower of the age which followed that of the apostles," as Keim says. Amongst all those critics, MM. Nicolas and Weizsäcker occupy a place by themselves, for they do not admit that the author had any *intention* to pass himself off for the Apostle John. It was the church which committed that error.

What is the intrinsic probability of all those hypotheses? That of Tobler is at once set aside: 1st. By the entire difference of ideas and style which separates the Gospel from the Epistle to the Hebrews. How can we imagine the same pen writing that Epistle and the First Epistle of John? That consideration, undoubtedly, is only valid for those who, like Tobler, attribute to Apollos the Epistle to the Hebrews. 2d. The qualification of eye-witness, to which the author lays claim, does not apply to the Alexandrian theologian (comp. his arrival on the stage of Christianity, Acts xviii. 24 ff.). 3d. It would be impossible to explain how so important a work, proceeding from a man so well known, could have passed universally as the composition of John. 4th. The absence of internal evidence, favourable to that hypothesis, is not compensated for by any traditional data to support it; so its author remains its only patron.

The hypothesis of M. Nicolas has in its favour the identity of name of the two personages; but, 1st. That circumstance would only be of real importance if the name of John were inscribed at the head of the Gospel or the Epistle, as it is at the head of the Apocalypse. That alone could explain a mistake. 2d. If the Presbyter John did exist, as, with M. Nicolas, I admit he did, he could not have been a very important personage; for Papias places him, in the enumeration of his authorities, after Aristion himself; while Polycrates, who in his letter to Victor designates as eminent witnesses of the apostolic tradition in Asia, after the apostles Philip and John, Polycarp

of Smyrna, Thraseas of Eumenia, Sagaris of Laodicea, Melito of Sardis, passes over the Presbyter John in silence. 3d. The traditions which Papias and Irenæus had inherited from that presbyter possessed a character of gross millenarianism, which contrasts with the spirituality of our Gospel, and even with the purity of the millenarianism of the Apocalypse. 4th. That Presbyter John could not have failed to form one of the circle of disciples from whom the attestation of chap. xxi. proceeded, which attributes the fourth Gospel to the disciple whom Jesus loved (ver. 24). What would we think of his character if he himself were the author of the book thus attested?

Setting aside the fancies of Lützelberger, we pass on to the great anonymous of the school of Baur. Here we ask, 1st. How in the course of the second century there could have lived, not an apostolic genius,—there was nothing to prevent an exceptional man from arising at that period,—but an apostolic genius who has remained absolutely unknown in the midst of all the mediocrities of the time? We are acquainted with the illustrious writers of that time. They are Clement of Rome, Polycarp, Papias. We are acquainted also with their writings; for instance, that *wonderful* epistle of Clement, respecting which Eusebius falls into raptures (ἐπιστολὴ μεγάλη τε καὶ θαυμασία); and we must say that all those writings are scarcely superior to what a pious letter from a very moderately endowed Christian of our own days would be. What an incommensurable distance betwixt our fourth Gospel and these Patristic compositions! And in the midst of all those men, excellent indeed, but without striking originality, there lived a man who surpassed them all, as genius surpasses mediocrity, "the brilliant flower of that age;" that man took an active part in the movements of the church of his time; he claimed to guide it, and to give it an impulse in a new direction; he laboured in the service of that cause with all the brilliancy of his genius; and of that exceptional man everybody was ignorant of the presence. He passed across his age without any other indication than that our Gospel and the first Epistle testified to his existence. It may be said, Where is the author of the Book of Job? or of the Epistle to the Hebrews? or of the Epistle to Diognetus? Those men also have remained unknown. But what a difference between the

remote antiquity to which the first of these writings belongs, and that second century of the church respecting which we have such copious and detailed information! The Epistle to the Hebrews and that to Diognetus are mere treatises, whilst the fourth Gospel is an ecclesiastical work of supreme importance, which could not fail to reveal the person of its author to the church. There is here a first impossibility, which we shall call historical.

2d. There is yet another of a *psychological* nature. Let us suppose that a theologian of the church of the second century could have undertaken to substitute, on his own authority, a new view of the person of Christ, in place of those which, up to his time, had been dominant in the church, would he not at least have taken care to connect himself as closely as possible with the generally received outline of his external life? In substituting an entirely new history of our Lord's ministry for that which the Synoptics had sketched, would he not very needlessly have run the risk of compromising the result of his undertaking, and of preventing the admission into the church of the doctrine with which he sought to impress it? Weizsäcker has rightly said: "An author who merely wrote that Gospel in order to introduce certain ideas into the church, would never have ventured to invent an historical basis so different from that presented by the prevailing traditions."[1] M. Renan thinks the same: "A forger, writing about the year 120 or 130 an imaginary Gospel, would have contented himself with treating the received version after his own fancy, as is the case in the apocryphal Gospels, and would not have overturned from the foundation what was regarded as the main points in the life of Jesus."[2] Our author is, at all events, an intelligent man; he would certainly not have acted contrary to his intention.

3d. What will be the case if, from the psychological improbability, we pass to the *moral* difficulty? We have already noticed it in examining the credibility of the narratives and

[1] *Jahrb. für D. Theol.* 1859, p. 698.

[2] Pp. lxxv., lxxvi. M. Renan adds, that that procedure on the part of the author supposes a time when our Synoptics had not yet acquired full canonical authority; he forgets that, in his own opinion, the fourth Gospel itself presupposes the circulation of these three writings to be already established, and makes frequent allusion to their statements as generally admitted.

discourses. Here is an historian of the life of Jesus who presents as nourishment to the faith of the church a history and words of our Lord, *in the reality of which he does not himself believe*, and who asserts that life is to be found in attachment to that imaginary personage, and to those fictitious words; or who, *if he does believe in that reality*, accords belief to a history and words of which he is himself the fabricator. Are those the acts of a man of sense? Still further: According to the Tübingen School, that man calculates the most minute details in his narrative in such a way as to pass himself off falsely as the Apostle John, and (according to Baur) as the author of the Apocalypse. This artifice is justified from a moral point of view by quoting a multitude of similar instances from Jewish and Christian literature, and by urging the pious purpose which the writer had in view. But what known forger in that domain ever made such a use of the subject of his fiction as our author has done with his? The apocryphal Gospels embellish a theme universally received. They limit themselves to filling up with unimportant fables the blanks left in the life of Jesus by our canonical writings. The attempt of our author was attended with serious consequences of an altogether different kind. The point in question for him was nothing less than to substitute a Christ historically and dogmatically new for that of the Synoptics. Could two methods of procedure, so different in their aims, be compared in a moral point of view? Keim says: "Our author has written in the sincere conviction that John would have written in a precisely similar manner had he still been alive in his time" (p. 171). But Hilgenfeld declares, without any circumlocution, that the aim of the false John, on the contrary, was, by means of his writing, to destroy the Judaizing work of the true Apostle John, and to substitute for the standard of legal Christianity that of Pauline spiritualism, which the Apostle John had laboured to overturn.[1] Could such a fraud as the making use of an historical personage, in order to destroy his work, and to supplant it by one of an opposite kind, be really regarded as an innocent proceeding? It is affirmed that the church at that period did not see anything wrong in the use of such methods of literary procedure. But it would

[1] *Einl.* p. 789.

be very strange if the spirit of truth, which its Head had bequeathed to it, had not energetically reproved such goings on. Dionysius of Corinth complained bitterly of "those who falsified his writings, as they did those of the Lord," and characterized them as servants of the devil, and pronounced on them a "Woe unto you!" The author of the apocryphal book entitled *The Acts of Paul and Thecla*, the general contents of which contained nothing offensive to the faith, was not regarded and treated in the second century as innocent by the church of Asia Minor, to which he belonged. It was in vain to allege that he had composed that short narrative with good intentions, and *from love of the Apostle Paul* (*id se amore Pauli fecisse*). Tertullian expressly relates,[1] "that having been convicted and having confessed, he was forced to give up his office as presbyter (*convictum atque confessum loco decessisse*);" and yet the author of that fable had not borrowed a well-known name under which to publish it, and that little romance contained no new gospel intended to supplant in many respects the true Gospels, but a simple anecdote regarding the person of Paul. Pious frauds in that domain might be practised; they were not approved of by the sentiment of the church.

4th. There remains a last improbability, which is, that under such conditions the fraud should have succeeded. "We nowhere find," says Weizsäcker, "the slightest trace that any attempt was made in the church to augment, in the course of the second century, by new gospels, the number of those which were already in use" (p. 224). It adhered, according to the expression of Bishop Serapion and of Clement of Alexandria, to the Gospels *which had been transmitted.* The more that heretical works abounded, the more was the church on her guard. Could it be conceivable that a book so important as that which introduced a new history of Jesus, and which, as

[1] In *de Baptismo.* Baur has, it is true, alleged that it was not for the fraud in itself that he was punished, but because the author of the book seemed to grant to women, contrary to 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35, the right to preach and to baptize. It is very possible that it was that contradiction with Scripture which led the colleagues of the presbyter to the discovery of the fraud; but Tertullian, who relates the fact, by no means attributes his dismissal to that contradiction with Paul. And how, indeed, can we explain, from this point of view of Baur, the excuse which he alleged: "*Se id amore Pauli fecisse*"?

M. Renan says, entirely overturned the received tradition, should not, in order to gain an entrance, have had to struggle against some ecclesiastical opposition, if the conviction of its apostolic origin had not rested, in the opinion of bishops and churches, on the ground of a transmission that was completely certain? "The course followed at such a time by the fourth Gospel would be," says Weizsäcker once more, "a phenomenon of an altogether strange kind." There is no doubt that the Second Epistle of Peter, although spurious,[1] has succeeded in obtaining a place in the Canon. But of how small importance was that work in comparison with a new gospel! And against what persistent opposition in the church itself had it not to contend, till, at the close of the fourth century, the Synods at last agreed to admit it! That instance which is urged against us is precisely the one which we ourselves plead against our opponents.

From all the foregoing considerations, we conclude that the "great unknown," that X of contemporaneous criticism, is nothing else than what in mathematics is called an *imaginary quantity*, and that instead of saying the "great unknown," we ought rather to speak of the "*great unrecognised*"—the Apostle John himself. If the scientific difficulties raised by the opinion which attributes the Gospel to him cannot even be altogether solved (as we do not believe they can), they are nothing in comparison with those which weigh on all the other solutions proposed.

CHAPTER III.

THE PLACE OF COMPOSITION.

In the midst of what churches was that work composed? Even if we knew nothing of the author's life, we would at all events say: In the bosom of churches of Hellenic language and culture. The author would not have given for Jewish readers the Greek translation of the Hebrew terms, of the title of the *Messiah*, for instance, and of the name of Siloah, or the explanation of Jewish customs, as ii. 6 (the purification

[1] Such is the author's conviction.

of the Jews), xix. 40 (the manner of embalming amongst the Jews), iv. 9 (the enmity prevailing between Jews and Samaritans), etc. The author takes a special pleasure in relating those events which, in the ministry of Jesus, have reference to the Greeks; as the request of those Greeks who, shortly before the Passover, desired to see Jesus (xii. 20); or that ironical question of the Jews: "Will he go unto the dispersed among the Gentiles?" (vii. 35). Those details have all their appropriateness amid Hellenic surroundings.

But there were Greek churches in many countries: in Syria, in Asia Minor, in Greece, and doubtless already in Alexandria. Which of these are we to select? Wittichen has made choice of Syria. Baur seems to incline to Alexandria. The greater number decide in favour of Asia Minor. The question cannot be doubtful for those who admit the sojourn and death of John in that last country. It was, moreover, in those churches that the influence of our Gospel made itself most strongly felt in the course of the second century. It was also at Ephésus that we find the theological and religious focus which affords the best explanation of the appearance of such a work. "Asia Minor," says M. Renan, "was at that period the theatre of a strange movement of syncretic philosophy. All the germs of Gnosticism already existed there" (p. lxxi.). No heresy so exactly corresponds with the polemic in the First Epistle of John as that of Cerinthus (who lived at Ephesus). Keim acknowledges it, and with reason asserts that that same polemic exists under a latent form in the Gospel.

Two biblical facts finally agree with those data which history supplies to us. It was at Ephesus that the Jew Apollos appeared, an Alexandrine by birth and culture. The term Logos had perhaps, in the system in which it presented itself in Ionia, a place analogous to that which Philo in his speculations accorded to it.[1] Moreover, it was to the churches of Asia Minor that St. Paul addressed those epistles whose aim and contents are most closely related to our Gospel and the First Epistle of John. These indications seem to us all-sufficient, and even decisive.

[1] Comp. Heb. iv. 12 (the personification of the Logos). In quoting that passage, we do not claim to share the opinion of the composition of that Epistle by Apollos; we merely speak of a common medium of culture.

CHAPTER IV.

THE OCCASION AND AIM OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

The subject which we are about to consider is evidently connected with the preceding by a bond of close solidarity. In addition to our two ordinary means of exploring our way, the statements of the Fathers, and the information supplied by the work itself, we are here in possession of a third; and that is, the declaration of the evangelist concerning the aim which he had in view in compiling that narrative (xx. 30, 31).

I.

In regard to the *circumstances* which led to the composition of that work, we may infer from four statements of the Fathers that John did not undertake it at his own suggestion, but under the influence of the solicitations of others. According to the *Fragment of Muratori* (see p. 248), there were certain apostles not named, who, in conjunction with the bishops of the country, requested that work from him. *Clement of Alexandria* speaks in a more general manner of the notable persons of the church: "John, the last survivor, seeing that external things had been described in the Gospels, at the instance of the leading men and under the inspiration of the Spirit, wrote a spiritual Gospel."[1] Eusebius, on the testimony of the ancients, relates (iii. 24) that when Matthew, Mark, and Luke had each published their Gospel, "those writings having come into the hands of all, and likewise into those of John, the latter approved of them and confirmed their truth, only regretting one thing, the omission of what Jesus had done at the beginning of His ministry. . . . The apostle, urged, it is said, by his friends, then wrote the things which the first evangelists had omitted (Eusebius here enlarges on John iii. 24), from which is seen the harmony of the Gospels with each other." Eusebius adds, that whilst

[1] Τὸν μέντοι Ἰωάννην ἔσχατον συνίδοντα ὅτι τὰ σωματικὰ ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις δεδήλωται, προτραπέντα ὑπὸ τῶν γνωρίμων, πνεύματι θεοφορηθέντα, πνευματικὸν ποιῆσαι εὐαγγέλιον (in Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 14).

Matthew and Luke have preserved to us the genealogy of Christ according to the flesh (*γενεαλογία*), John sets out from His divinity (*θεολογία*). "That was the part which the Divine Spirit had reserved for him, as the most excellent of all." Finally, Jerome narrates, in his emphatic style,[1] that as John was in Asia, and the seed of the heretics was already multiplying,—such as Cerinthus, Ebion, and others, who deny that Christ is come in the flesh,—he was constrained by almost all the bishops of Asia, and by deputations from numerous churches, to write something more profound respecting the divinity of the Saviour, and to soar upwards even to the word of God; for ecclesiastical history records that, on being solicited by the brethren, he replied that he would write, if all fasted and prayed to God with him; which they did. After which, the revelation with which he was filled burst forth in this prologue: "In the beginning was the Word."[2]

If we recall what we think we have established regarding the essentially receptive character of the apostle, and his want of external initiative, we must regard as very probable that tradition of a foreign impulse which was requisite to make him take pen in hand.

II.

But the question of the aim of the Gospel in that case in some sort changes its place; from the spirit of the author we must, in order to determine it, transfer ourselves to that of the instigators and readers. Why did the latter demand a Gospel from the apostle? The simplest answer is that which is given by the *Fragment of Muratori*. They felt that their churches required, in order to maintain the lofty position to which they had attained through the teaching of John, to possess in writing his evangelical testimony, which he had for so long a time orally delivered to them. They especially appreciated the necessity of such a work for those churches which had never heard the apostle. That is the most natural, the most

[1] *Comment. in Matth.* iv., *De vir. illustr.* c. 9.

[2] In this series of traditions we can easily follow the successive amplifications of a primitive datum, which thereby only appears in itself more *historical!* A river must have a source.

simple aim, that of direct *edification*. In *Clement* and *Eusebius* a slightly different aspect is presented to us. It is the perusal of the three Gospels by the church and by John himself which give rise to the composition of the fourth. John and those who surround him are conscious of a blank in those narratives from the point of view of the history of the earliest times according to Eusebius, or even from the most elevated point of view of the understanding of the whole history according to Clement. That is the *historico-didactic* aim.

To such a purpose Jerome adds another, that of controverting the heresies regarding the person of Christ (those of Cerinthus and the Ebionites). This latter opinion was, even before Jerome, that of Irenæus, at least in reference to the prologue: "John, the disciple of the Lord," he says, "wishing to root out, by the proclamation of the Gospel, the seed which had been scattered in the heart of men by Cerinthus, and previously by the Nicolaitans . . . and in order to prove that there is not, as that sect affirmed, one God, the Creator, and another God, the Father of the Lord, and a son of the Creator and another Christ come down from the heavenly places . . . wishing to set aside those doctrines and lay down the rule of truth in the church, commenced thus" (iii. 11. 1). That is the *polemical* aim.

These different aims do not exclude each other so much as might at first sight appear. John could not successfully contend against the heretics, except by reproducing the history and teaching of Jesus in their fulness. That intention, then, implies the aim of historical rectification as it is understood by Eusebius, how much more that same aim as it is apprehended by Clement!

But what does the *author* himself say on that important point (xx. 30, 31)? He first of all acquaints us with what was not his intention: "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of His disciples, which are not written in this book." The author did not wish to give a complete picture of the ministry of Jesus, and of all the manifestations of His glory in acts and in words which His disciples had beheld (ver. 30). But here is what he wished (ver. 31): "But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through

His name." He has then selected from the treasury of his recollections a certain number of traits, which he has committed to writing, in order that the church, whilst sharing his faith in the Messianic and divine character of Jesus, might partake of the life which he himself found through faith in that name. We see from the thirtieth verse how false is the critical process which consists in deducing from the omission of certain Synoptic statements in the fourth Gospel an argument against the truth of those statements; and from ver. 31, that, as the narrative of the *Fragment of Muratori* implies, the aim of the author was really and essentially *practical*. Having himself found life through faith in Jesus, first as the Messiah, then as the Son of God, he knew from his own experience that the church would find, entirely as he had done, life in that same faith; and he did not doubt that the manifestations of Jesus in acts and words, which had brought forth that vivifying faith in him, would likewise produce similar results in every church where his writings should be read. If the aim of the author had been of a speculative or even an exclusively didactic nature, as has been frequently supposed, that was the moment to say it, and to declare, not that he had written in order that the church might *believe* and *live*, but that he had written in order that it might *know* and *understand*. That was, above all, the moment, before concluding, to revive amongst his readers that theory of the Logos, in the interest of which it is alleged that his work was composed. At all events, it was contrary to that speculative aim to recall once more the title of *Christ*, the Jewish Messiah, which belonged to an historical era now passed away, and which had no part to play in the rational sphere in which the author is made to live and write. That practical intention of the evangelist is confirmed by the preamble of the first Epistle, where he declares that he wrote in order that his readers might, like him, have fellowship with Christ, and thereby fellowship likewise with the Father: it was with that design that he announced to them what he has seen, heard, and handled, because such historical testimony is the only means whereby those who have not seen, heard, and handled can participate in the life eternal revealed here below in the person of Christ (1 John i. 1-4). The reproach, which Keim applies to critics

of different schools, is assuredly well founded, "of having so frequently radically ignored the declaration contained in John xx. 30, 31, in which the author, in the most direct manner, discloses his aim to his readers" (p. 104). Would that Keim himself had only known how to attain a more satisfactory conclusion from that decisive declaration!

Finally, what does the book itself (independently of the testimony of the author) teach us in regard to the point in question? If we have succeeded in proving the autobiographical character of the narrative; if the history really begins with the day and hour when the first gleam of faith in Jesus displayed itself to the mind of the author; and if the limit of that narrative is the moment when that faith attained its accomplishment,—that is to say, when it rose to the height of its object itself ("my Lord and *my God*," xx. 28; comp. i. 1); if between these two extreme points we find the picture of a small number of days distributed over a space of upwards of two years, and each of which is like a beacon on the path which has led the apostles from one of these points to the other,—the aim of the book is at once evident. The author was desirous that his readers should be present at the genesis of his own faith and that of his colleagues. He wished to place under the eyes of the church the works and evidences which have specially contributed to reveal to him in Jesus, first the expected Messiah, then, by degrees, in that Messiah the very Son of God. And why does he retrace that history of the birth and development of his faith? Putting aside the explanation given by the author (xx. 30, 31), good sense replies: In traversing with him the same luminous path, the reader must attain, under the dominion of the same facts, to similar faith. We may apply to the whole evangelical narrative what the author said on the occasion of a special event, xix. 35: "He that saw it bare record, and his record is true; and he knoweth that he saith true, *that ye might believe*."

The result of the study of the Gospel, then, is precisely the same as that to which the declaration of the author has brought us.

Would it follow, perhaps, from the expression: "These things were written *that ye might believe*" . . ., that the readers did not yet believe what the evangelist desired that they

should believe; that his aim, consequently, was to introduce into the church a new conception of the person of Jesus, that which his speculation had disclosed to him? Such is the idea given expression to by a great many modern critics.[1] But if such was his thought, he would not, in writing these last words of his book, have expressed himself thus: "that ye might believe that Jesus is *the Christ*." For how can we suppose that there could be in the church a single believer who did not yet confess that Jesus was the promised Messiah? The expression: *that ye might believe*, does not, then, mean that he desires to bring about something new in the department of faith, to raise his readers to a conviction which they do not possess; but that he desired to add to the faith already existing in his hearers' minds new and impregnable supports. Such an interpretation is confirmed by that express declaration addressed in the first Epistle by the same author to the same audience (ii. 21): "I have not written unto you, because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it, and that no lie is of the truth (and consequently must not be permitted to blend its alloy with it)."

These latter words show us the close connection which exists in the mind of the author between the essentially *practical* aim which we have just proved from tradition, from the declaration of the author, and from the book itself, and a second aim, indirect, undoubtedly, but not the less real—the *polemical* aim. Why did the author, as well as all the influential men who surrounded him, feel the necessity of strengthening the faith of the church in Jesus as the Messiah and as the Son of God? Because the falsehoods of human speculation had already begun to undermine that faith. The first Epistle assuredly proves that the evangelist had already existing errors in view; it is only the historical character of the Gospel which does not permit him to combat them so directly as he was able to do in

[1] Lücke: "John wished to raise mere faith to the condition of Gnosis" (higher intelligence). Olshausen: "That book specially addresses itself to Gnostico-mystic minds." Reuss: "The prologue is not the preface of an historian, but the programme of a thinker and of a theologian." Keim: "The author wished to diffuse a more lofty idea respecting the person of Jesus . . . the external, the circumstantial, is for him only a medium, sign, scenery, scaffolding, material basis whereon he erects the pneumatic edifice of a world of higher religious ideas" (p. 107).

the Epistle. He had to limit himself to the bringing prominently forward, in a special manner, whatever in the history and teaching of Jesus was opposed to those errors. It was on that account that this work corresponded to a pressing need. And facts have proved that the apostle and his friends did not rely in vain on that storehouse of recollections which formed, as it were, his peculiar property. If the unbridled waves of heresy, which assailed the church during the second century, broke against a rock, that rock was especially the fourth Gospel, with those words which constitute its basis: "The Word was made flesh."

Finally, the *historical* aim itself, pointed out under two different forms by Eusebius and by Clement, may also very naturally be connected as a *means* with the principal aim, the aim of practical edification which we have demonstrated in the first place. Keim makes no difficulty in admitting, for instance, that the remark in iii. 24 was intended to "justify" the introduction of John the Baptist at that moment on the scene (p. 107),—that is the historical aim. But why that justification, according to Keim himself, except to remove from the mind of his readers an opposite idea, which made the simultaneous existence of the two ministries of John and of Jesus in Judea impossible, and consequently, also, the final testimony of John respecting Jesus, related by the evangelist (iii. 27–36)? The practical aim of the author imperiously demanded the complete statement of that final testimony of the forerunner regarding the person of Jesus; and thus, in this particular instance, it becomes clear how that principal aim necessarily contained, as an auxiliary aim, the rectification or completion of the generally admitted evangelical history. In rectifying the misunderstanding which might arise from the Synoptic narrative in regard to the day of the death of Jesus, the author had in like manner a more lofty intention than that of minutely elucidating the historical fact. He wished to set forth the divine symbolism, in accordance with which the true Paschal Lamb had expired on the cross on the very day and at the same hour in which the typical lamb was sacrificed in the temple. The author loved to point out these providential coincidences. His nascent faith had found in them support; he thought that his readers might find in them a means of

strengthening theirs. If the author specially dwells on the visits to Jerusalem, it is because it was in that capital that Jesus had given the most striking testimonies to the truth on which He wished in an especial manner to establish the faith of the church. To complete His teaching was therefore impossible without completing the history itself. That opinion, in accordance with which the author intended to complete or to rectify the Synoptic narrative, has been very harshly treated by several critics, particularly by M. Reuss.[1] In our judgment, that scholar would do well to reserve his severity for errors of a more real and dangerous kind. It is still more easy to include the *historico-didactic* aim pointed out by Clement in the principal one. What is a *spiritual* gospel, if not a narrative presenting to the church, not a multiplicity of particular events, but history in its inmost meaning and its highest range? Now, this is precisely the salient characteristic of our Gospel. It does not narrate the institution of the Holy Supper any more than that of baptism; but it reveals the spiritual essence of these two ceremonies (chap. vi. and chap. iii.). It does not relate the agony in Gethsemane, but it enables us to understand its true nature from the narrative in chap. xii. There is nothing there which has a resemblance to a speculative design; for, as we have shown, the words of Jesus which he repeats on those occasions, very far from being invented, are merely selected, and reproduced as revealing the spirit of the facts. That is what Clement meant to say; and the entire Gospel confirms that assertion.

We believe, in like manner, that a choice between the different aims proposed, since the awakening of science, by the numerous writers who have applied themselves to the subject, is not indispensable. If *Lessing* admits, as Jerome did long ago, that the evangelist had in view the *Ebionites*, represented at that time by Cerinthus and Carpocrates; if *Grotius* and *Storr* believe that he sharpened his weapons against *the Gnostics* and *the disciples of John the Baptist;* if *Semler* and

[1] Keim: "The evangelist is indeed much too great" to follow out that historical aim. Reuss: "Henceforth such a poor argument can only be maintained by the slaves of the most vulgar Patristic traditions" (*Hist. de la theol. chrétienne*, ii. p. 312). Such an opinion is very coarse "and very dangerous" (*Geschichte der heil. Schriften Neuen Test.*, sec. 222).

Schneckenburger admit that he wished to combat the *Docetæ*; if *de Wette* prefers to represent the Ebionites and the Gnostics *reunited* as the subjects of his polemics; if, on the other hand, *Ewald* lays great stress, as Eusebius formerly did, on the historical *complemental* aim of our Gospel in reference to the Synoptics,—we find nothing positively erroneous in all those different points of view. Even the most special polemic, that which is directed against the disciples of John, does not appear to us as if it ought to be entirely excluded. It would not be difficult for us to discover some traces of it in certain passages, such as i. 8, 15, iii. 5, 25 ff., iv. 2; 1st Epist. v. 6; and all the more that the trait related in Acts xix. 1 ff. proves that those former disciples of the forerunner were at that time moving about the countries of Asia Minor.

It is thus, then, that we shall sum up our way of regarding that subject. The essential aim of the fourth Gospel was to supply an impregnable basis to the faith of the church. But that aim naturally implied, as a *consequence*, the strengthening of the church against the false doctrines which were at that period threatening its faith, and as an indispensable *means*, the re-establishment of the exact and complete historical framework of the ministry of Jesus and the revelation of the solemn import of His words, of His acts, and of His whole appearance. We see that these were not diverse aims, but that each one of those which have been brought forward as the chief aim may easily be included, either as a means or a consequence, in the true aim to which alone that name belongs. Amongst all the aims admitted by modern criticism, there is only one which ought absolutely to be set aside,—that is, the philosophical or *speculative* aim. We think that we have already set forth the reasons for its exclusion. The new direction into which *Baur* and *Hilgenfeld* have sought to turn it does not render it more acceptable. In connecting his theory of the Logos with the person of the Saviour, the author followed a very practical result. According to Baur, he wished to establish by that higher conception of the person of Christ, which predominated over all previous conceptions, the unity of the church, which up to that time was divided into two hostile camps. According to Hilgenfeld, his intention was to supplant in Asia Minor the legal Christianity which the Apostle John had in-

troduced into that country, and to unfurl anew the standard of the spiritualism of Paul, consigned to the background by the Apostle John, who came after him. From respect even towards the theory of the Logos, we cannot accept those hypotheses, which would cast it down from its speculative eminence by making of it a means of ecclesiastical politics. But still less can we understand how an earnest believer could have made the person of Jesus act the part of an instrument in these deeds of military tactics.[1]

CHAPTER V.

SUMMING UP.

Now is the time to gather together all the data which, as really historical facts, emerge from the sieve of criticism, and to reconstruct with these materials the fact of the composition of our Gospel in its entirety. The Apostle John, who arrived in Asia Minor after the fall of Jerusalem, had laboured during a certain number of years in the midst of these flourishing churches, which had been the fruit of the activity and prayers of St. Paul.

He had many times related to those Christians, eager to hear from the most intimate disciple of Him whom they worshipped as their Lord, the decisive circumstances which had led him to that faith in which he had found life, and which he now proclaimed in the face of the world: how he

[1] Amongst recent hypotheses we may further note, as a particularly curious piece of work, the system set forth by M. Noack in his work, *Aus der Jordan—Wiege nach Golgotha*, 1870: Jesus, the son of Mary and a Samaritan soldier, came, as the very effect of that discreditable birth, to regard God as his Father. He lived in a constant state of ecstasy, which he maintained by artificial means, such as fasting, for instance. After having kept himself at that artificial elevation till he could do so no longer, he sought for death; and the person who assisted him to realize that wish, and so became the accessary to this final act in His life, was—Judas. He it is who was *the disciple whom Jesus loved;* it is he who was the author of the fourth Gospel, which underwent a transformation at a later period, but the primitive meaning of which was restored by M. Noack. Jesus died on Gerizim, whither he had withdrawn with his seven disciples, and where, with the help of Judas, he fell into the hands of his enemies, and was deprived of life.

had for the first time his attention drawn to Jesus, then become personally acquainted with Him; how, after having recognised Him as the Messiah, he had very soon discerned in that Messiah a man holding a unique relation to God; finally, a being who came forth, not like us, from nothing, but from God Himself; the Son of God, the bread of life, come down from heaven.

But side by side with these hearers, who made his faith theirs by means of his oral testimony, he saw around him other persons bearing also the name of Christians, who realized only too faithfully Paul's prediction, when, bidding farewell to the elders of those countries, he said to them: "For I know this, that after my departure shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock." By their false speculations they altered more or less completely the facts of the evangelical history; the person of Jesus was especially entirely disfigured; and under these human travesties it could no longer supply to faith the nutriment which Jesus brought into the world.

No doubt, the first three Gospels, the only ones which, with our fourth, were ever *received by the whole church*, as Ritschl[1] has well demonstrated, were already disseminated. But they were not sufficient to defend the church against that torrent, which went on increasing from day to day.

Those who for a long period had had the good fortune to listen to John, knew from experience that his narratives and instructions contained all that was necessary to meet, at that critical moment, the wants of the church. What could be more natural than the appeal which they then made to his devotedness to the cause of the Lord, and his love for the church? John responded to their solicitation, by drawing up the testimony which he had not ceased to bear in the midst of them with the living voice. He did not directly attack any tendency. He understood that in that capital fact of the Gospel history—the union, in the person of the Son, of God with human nature—was to be found the solution of all the problems, which the intellect of his own time was already proposing, or which the intellect could ever propose, as well as the perfect satisfaction of the infinite aspirations of the

[1] In his well-known article, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1851, 4th number.

heart of man: the truth and the life. He therefore clearly formulated that sublime fact, and related the way whereby he had himself come to verify it, and to accord to it his faith. He by no means proposed to relate all the details with which he was acquainted of the history of his Master, nor to repeat the whole of His teachings. What would be the use of recounting what had already been said, and well said? He had a definite end in view, imposed on him by the society with which he was surrounded,—let us recall to mind the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians,—the person of the Lord. He related all the acts and all the discourses of Jesus which most distinctly marked out the history of his own faith on that fundamental point. In writing out the discourses, he reproduced their substance as it had slowly condensed itself in his mind, and as he could best do it in the new language which was imposed on him, seeking to say the same things as Christ Himself might have said them had He uttered them in the midst of the same surroundings. And however impossible it may appear to draw a perfectly exact line of demarcation between what belongs to the historical objectivity and what results from the subjectivity of the apostle, in that reproduction we may be certain, from the sentiment of adoration which he felt to his Master, and even from comparison with the Synoptic Gospels, that neither in its substance nor its form did he change the history and the teachings of Jesus. Thus it is to him that we are indebted for the knowledge both of the general outline of the ministry of Jesus and a multitude of features of detail, regarding which the Synoptics only present obscurities or blanks. Such is the picture which corresponds with the data which have been supplied to us by the impartial study of the traditions and of the Gospel itself. It is impossible for us to discover therein a single feature which does not possess the character of probability.

Conclusion.

This work leads us to the following conclusions: The authenticity of the fourth Gospel has nothing to fear from the judgment of a really impartial and strictly scientific criticism.

The animosity of contemporary criticism against this work

has its starting-point in an *à priori* principle, the negation of the supernatural in the history of humanity. The question for this criticism is to remove at any price a witness for the prosecution, whose evidence against the naturalistic point of view would be overwhelming.

The tone of lofty assurance with which this criticism proclaims its victory to the world is doubtless due to the desire of disguising from the public, and of concealing from itself, the vague uneasiness which it continues to feel in presence of that work, through fear of seeing that dead body all at once regain life, and stand erect before the human conscience, as the Risen One whose history it relates.

Can criticism, indeed, not know that the sphere of *being* infinitely surpasses, not that of *absolute thought*, but that of limited and relative thought such as we possess? Can it, moreover, conceal from itself the arbitrary and artificial element in the process by means of which it has succeeded in deluding itself, and, for the moment, dazzling public opinion? Keim has proudly declared, in beginning his criticism of our Gospel: "Our age has reversed the judgment of centuries." Supposing that Keim and the other organs of the dominant criticism constitute "our age," there is no guarantee that the decree of our age should be the last word of science.

If, as we have seen, the Gospel of John is authentic, if the discourses which he puts into the mouth of Jesus are the truth, then Jesus is the Word made flesh, a divine gift, the proof of a boundless love in God. Immediately heaven opens, and humanity there contemplates a Father's heart, to which it has the fullest access. From this open heaven descends an outpouring of life, which penetrates the human soul, and imparts to it the powers of the world to come. If it be not authentic, heaven is closed. There only remains of the life of Jesus the love of an excellent man for his brethren. The Father has given nothing *of His own*. It is obliterated. Jesus has done and suffered more for us than He. He has loved us more generously than God Himself. We can no longer say of God, with Paul: "He that spared not His own Son," nor what follows in Rom. viii. 32.

And what must humanity be, to have been able of itself to bring forth such fruit? "A corrupt tree cannot bring forth

good fruit." The appearance of Christ is no longer the glory of God, as St. Paul said: it is the honour of humanity. That Old Testament, from which all the fibres of the heart of Jesus drew their nourishment, and the contents of which are all summed up in that prayer: "O Lord, righteousness belongeth unto Thee; but to us, confusion of face!" is false throughout, not only in the letter, but in its spirit. The Jesus with whom we are acquainted in the Synoptics cannot be the product of that humanity with which Moses and the prophets make us acquainted. The incarnation was the normal termination of the growing union, which the Old Testament describes to us, between a God who wishes to save, and a humanity which, without the law or under the law, was perishing . . . this first suppressed, the whole tree disappears.

What keeps back many thoughtful men at the present day in presence of the fact of the incarnation, is the fear of losing in Jesus the man, the true man. It seems to them impossible to reconcile a real human condition with a personality of divine origin. But has not God said: "I am what I am"? Is a divine *person* bound to a divine *condition*? Can it not enter into a state of an inferior order, provided that there is nothing therein incompatible with the dignity and the holiness of God? And if man has been created *in the image of God*, can it be unworthy of the Divine Being to enter fully into a human development resembling ours; to *be made flesh*, as the apostle says; to renounce, according to the expression of St. Paul, the riches,—that is to say, the sovereign independence of the divine mode of existence,—in order to accept *poverty*, the complete indigence of the human manner of existence?[1] And what other fact, save that act of self-spoliation and divine abasement, could have the power to draw men to Himself, to soften their strong heart, to shatter their pride? Every other means would only touch the surface of the evil; the latter alone extirpates it. Man wishes to be as God. God, in order to cure this insatiable ambition, makes Himself man, redeems us, justifies us, radically transforms us, and, to consummate that work of infinite condescension, unites us to His divinity, and makes of us in the universe the instruments of His perfect life, of His omnipotence, of His love, and His sovereign holiness.

[1] John i. 14; 2 Cor. viii. 9; Phil. ii. 6.

Is such a human thought? Does it not bear on itself the impress of its origin?

We pass on to the study of those pages, in which we contemplate that divine thought realized in history. May those unrivalled pages be themselves, in the estimation of our readers, their *best* defence!

COMMENTARY

ON THE

GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN.

INTRODUCTION.

DEVOTING the first part of our volume to the general introduction to the Fourth Gospel, we have reserved two subjects which, from their very nature, appear to us more appropriately treated in a special introduction to the commentary properly so called. These are the statement of the leading opinions in regard to the *plan* of the Gospel, and the enumeration of the most important *documents* in which the text of this narrative has been preserved to us. These two topics form the subject of the two chapters of this introduction.

CHAPTER I.

THE DIFFERENT CONCEPTIONS OF THE PLAN OF THE GOSPEL.

Between the exegesis of the Fathers and modern works on the Gospel of John there is a marked difference. With the former, the idea of a plan and a systematic order seems almost to have no existence, so entirely is the historical character of the writing assumed as certain. According to the modern conception, on the contrary, of which Baur's work is the most complete expression, the *idea* plays so decisive a part, that not only does it determine its order and plan, but furnishes even its substance, so that fact, as such, is almost annihilated; and that allegorical exposition, the name of which till now recalled the worst days of exegesis, is reinstated as the really normal method of interpretation. In the eyes of the ancients, our Gospel was only a collection of facts and discourses accidentally connected with one another. At the present day, on the

contrary, it is a work of the reason rigorously systematic, the purest synthesis of the Christian idea, but a work as independent of history as it is possible for the Ethics of Spinoza to be of sensible realities.

This complete reversal of the point of view has come about gradually. The works of Lampe, de Wette, Schweizer, and Baur seem to me to form the main points in this scientific process.[1]

Lampe was the first to propose, according to Lücke, a general division of the Gospel. It was still very rude: 1. The prologue, i. 1–18; 2. The narrative, i. 19–xx. 29; 3. The epilogue, xx. 30–xxi. 25. Then, what had greater value, he subdivided the narrative into two parts: *A*, The public ministry of our Lord, i. 19–xii. 50; *B*, The last acts of His life, xiii. 1–xx. 29. Lampe had thus put his finger upon one of the leading divisions of the Gospel. All his successors who have effaced the boundary line between chaps. xii. and xiii. have gone backward in the understanding of John's work.

Eichhorn made no change in this division. Only he gave other titles to the two parts of the narrative properly so called: 1. The first, i. 19–xii., was intended, according to him, to demonstrate that Jesus is the promised *Messiah;* 2. The second, xiii.–xx., contains the account of the *last days* of His life. This was not a real improvement. The contents of the first part are badly designated (Eichhorn applies to the first twelve chapters what really applies only to the first four); and the idea of the second part is not logically co-ordinate with that of the first.

Before Eichhorn, Bengel[2] had endeavoured to settle the division of the Gospel on another principle. After ingeniously bringing into correspondence the initial week (i. 19–ii. 11) and the final week (xii. 1–xx. 31), regarding them as pendants, he divided the intermediate history according to the feasts, holding chiefly by the three journeys of Jesus to Jerusalem, mentioned ii. 13 (Passover), v. 1 (Pentecost, according to Bengel), vii. 2 (Tabernacles). But this arrangement evidently rested on too external a principle. It had, besides, the great disadvantage of obliterating the separation so strongly marked.

[1] In treating this subject, we are under special obligation to the work of Luthardt, *das Joh. Evang.*, 2d ed., i. pp. 200–222.

[2] *Gnomon N. T.*, 1742.

by the evangelist himself, and indicated by Lampe, between chap. xii. and xiii.

Nevertheless, Bengel was followed by Olshausen, who, in accordance with this principle of division, laid down these four parts: 1. i.–vi.; 2. vii.–xi.; 3. xii.–xvii.; 4. xviii.–xxi. Lücke himself, in his first two editions, despaired of reaching a profounder plan, and contented himself with striving to improve the division which is founded on the journeys to the feasts.

De Wette was the first to discern and bring out the development of one idea in our Gospel. The *glory of Christ*, such was the thought round which the entire work seemed to him to revolve: 1. The first chapter unfolds the idea summarily; 2. The first part of the narrative (ii.–xii.) exhibits it translated into action in the ministry of Jesus, and that: *A*, By particular examples (ii.–vi.); *B*, By the preparation for the catastrophe during the last visits of Jesus to Judea (vii.–xii.); 3. The glory of our Lord appears in all its brightness in the second part of the narrative (xiii.–xx.), and that: *A*, Inwardly and morally, in His sufferings and death (xiii.–xix.); and *B*, Outwardly and sensibly, in the triumphant event of the resurrection (xx.).

This great and beautiful conception, by which de Wette certainly forms an epoch in the understanding of our Gospel, prevailed in exegesis for a time. Lücke came decidedly under its influence in his third edition; but at the same time he introduced a subdivision, which must not be lost sight of. That is the separation between chap. iv. and v. Indeed, up to chap. iv. the opposition to Jesus does not yet make itself distinctly known. From chap. v. it gives character to the narrative, and goes on increasing to chap. xii.

Baumgarten-Crusius, taking advantage of de Wette's conception, and of the happy subdivision introduced by Lücke, was led to adopt the following arrangement:—1. The works of Christ, i.–iv.; 2. His struggles, v.–xii.; 3. His moral victory, xiii.–xix.; 4. His final glory, xx. It was de Wette's idea put in a still better form than it had been by de Wette himself. It was the first thoroughly rational division of the whole contents of our Gospel. Almost all the leading divisions of the narrative were established and indicated (v., xiii., xx.).

Yet the division of de Wette and of those who followed

him takes account of only one of the elements of the narrative, the objective factor, if one may so speak, Christ and His manifestation. But there is another element in John's narrative, the subjective factor, the conduct of men towards our Lord on occasion of His revelation, the faith of some and the unbelief of others.

Alexander Schweizer vindicated a place for this human element in the general order of our Gospel. He assigned it even the decisive part, and that while resting mainly on the side of unbelief. He maintains the following plan, which reproduces precisely the leading sections which we have just indicated:—1. The struggle making itself heard in the distance, i.–iv.; 2. Breaking out in all its violence, v.–xii.; 3. The issue, xiii.–xx. Thus understood, the Gospel becomes a drama, and assumes a tragic interest. But in the conduct of men towards our Lord, unbelief is but one side. Does not the element of faith remain too much in the background in this conception of Schweizer? The factor thus neglected could not long fail to vindicate its place.

Before coming to this point, so easily foreseen, we ought to mention some remarkable works which appear to us to be connected, if not historically at least in principle, with the standpoint already mentioned. Like de Wette and Baumgarten-Crusius, M. Reuss makes the general order of the Gospel turn on the revelation of Christ.[1] He maintains three parts: 1. Jesus revealing Himself to the *world*, i.–xii.; enrolling, i.–iv.; then selecting, v.–xii.; 2. Jesus revealing Himself to *His own*, xiii.–xvii., seeking to infuse into their heart, and to convert into their innermost life, the speculative ideas expressed in the first part in a dogmatical or polemical form. Thus far the order is perfectly logical, and in those few words there are undoubtedly contained ideas fitted to shed light on the progress of Christ's work in our fourth Gospel. But here arises a difficulty, due to the general standpoint which M. Reuss takes up in regard to the work of John: the rational division is exhausted. There is no third term to be placed logically beside the *world* and *believers*. And yet the Gospel is not at an end, and a place must be assigned to the three

[1] *Hist. de la Théol. chrét.*, 2d ed., t. ii., pp. 392-394. *Die Gesch. der heil. Schr. N. T.*, 5th ed., 1874, sec. 221.

chapters which yet remain. M. Reuss forms them into a third part, which he entitles, "The denouement of the two relations previously established," xviii.–xx. But how does the narrative of Christ's death and resurrection resolve the knot formed by the twofold relation of Jesus to the world and believers? Inasmuch, answers M. Reuss, as "Jesus remains dead to the unbelieving, while to believers He rises again victoriously." If, in such a matter, an ingenious phrase were enough, one might declare himself satisfied. But can M. Reuss be so himself? Must he not perceive that a purely historical termination does not square with a speculative gospel—an *ideal* work, such as *his* Gospel of John is? Speculative theorems and historic facts are not to be summed up in order one, two, three, unless we have come to the conclusion to see in the latter also nothing but ideas, a religion, or a system of morals in action. And is not this what M. Reuss really seems to do, when he closes his analysis of our Gospel with the words, "Thus it is that the history to its very end is the mirror of religious truths"? What! events like those of the Saviour's death and resurrection transformed into simple illustrations of religious truth,—in other words, of John's metaphysics? But in no other way is it possible for M. Reuss to make of the Gospel a homogeneous whole, and to co-ordinate the third part logically with the other two. We see at what cost this higher conception must be purchased, which regards the fourth Gospel as formed by John's *reflections on the person of Christ!*

Ebrard returned so fully to the positive character of the history, that he fell back on the plan of Bengel, and anew connected the order of our Gospel with the feast-journeys. But he discovered a profounder meaning for this principle of division, which is apparently altogether external. He justly remarked that the journeys of Jesus to Judea are the real knots of the history; for, Jerusalem being the centre of resistance, every period during which Jesus resided in the capital, instead of being a step towards His exaltation, became one towards the final catastrophe. Nevertheless, we have already seen, and we shall again see, the insufficiency of this division.

De Wette had made everything turn on the objective element, the manifestation of the glory of Jesus. Schweizer

had set prominently in relief one of the subjective factors, viz. unbelief. Baur laid hold of the other. He sought to point out in our Gospel the (ideal) history of the development of faith. To this task he devoted the resources of a mind at once the most sagacious and unshrinking; and thus he has powerfully contributed to demonstrate the unity of John's work. He divided the Gospel into nine sections, but which, excepting the prologue, and passing over certain secondary divisions, may be reduced to five: 1. The first manifestations of the Word, and the first symptoms of faith and unbelief resulting therefrom, i.–vi. 2. The (dialectic) victory of faith over its opposite, unbelief, vii.–xii. 3. The positive development of faith, xiii.–xvii. Arrived at this point, there is the same perplexity for Baur as for M. Reuss. How to pass from idea to history, from the dialectic development of faith to the positive facts of the Saviour's death and resurrection? The idea demands nothing more. In this way continues Baur. 4. The death of Jesus appears as the work of unbelief; 5. His resurrection as the consummation of faith. Such is the meaning of xviii.–xx. But, in spite of this dexterous manipulation, this last part is nevertheless an afterbirth, as in the case of M. Reuss. The passion and resurrection are facts too grave to have their place seriously assigned them in the recital of the dialectical development of faith, and to be made mere indicators on the path which leads from the objection of Nathanael (chap. i.) to the cry of faith uttered by Thomas (chap. xx.). We must either idealize the fourth Gospel to the very end, or, by a retrogressive conclusion, starting from the truly historical character of the last part, recognise also that of the preceding parts.[1]

Luthardt accepted almost entirely the results of Baur's labours on the special point before us. Only as the basis of the development of faith he laid down the historical revelation of Christ, so well brought out by de Wette. The Son displays His glory; faith is born, but at the same time unbelief awakes;

[1] Here comes to light, in regard to a particular point, the difficulty which attaches to the entire philosophical standpoint on which Baur's theology rests. In virtue of what logical necessity does the idea pass from its pure existence to translate itself into fact? The pure idea leads only to the pure idea! The *fact* is there . . . , such is the only reason. Hegel himself was never able to find another.

and very soon Jesus can no longer manifest the divine principle which is in Him, except in conflict with the hostile elements which surround Him. Nevertheless, in the midst of this conflict, faith gathers strength in the disciples, and the moment arrives when Jesus, after having broken with the people and their leaders, gives Himself wholly to the faith of His own, and impresses on it the seal of perfection. Hence Luthardt gives the three following divisions:—1. Jesus beginning to reveal Himself as the Son of God, i.–iv.; 2. Jesus continuing to give testimony to Himself, while contending with Jewish unbelief, v.–xii.; 3. Jesus giving Himself completely to the faith of His own, xiii.–xx.

Luthardt, following in the steps of Baur, seems to me to have penetrated further than any one else into the spirit of the book, and into the inmost thought which guided the course of the narrative. And yet the defective point in the plan which he proposes is perfectly obvious; it is found in the last section. How are we to include the account of the passion in the third section, entitled, *Jesus and His own?* Luthardt is certainly mistaken when he confounds in one group elements so heterogeneous as those which are contained in his third part, xiii.–xx.

Meyer's division appears to me to be rather a retrograde step than one in advance. On the one hand, it raises secondary parts to the rank of principal parts. For example, in the first eleven chapters, which Meyer divides into four sections: 1. The first revelations of the glory of the Son, i. 1–ii. 11; 2. The continuation of this revelation in the face of growing faith and unbelief, ii. 12–iv.; 3. New revelations and growth of unbelief, v., vi.; 4. Unbelief arrived at its culminating point, vii.–xi. On the other hand, Meyer unites in one parts which are entirely distinct, when he throws together xii.–xx. into one group, entitled, 5. The highest manifestation of the glory of Jesus before, during, and after His passion.

M. Arnaud[1] returned to the division of Bengel, Olshausen, and Ebrard according to the feast-journeys. Thus, between the prologue and the resurrection, he has five parts, corresponding to the five journeys indicated by the evangelist: 1. ii. 13 (Passover); 2. v. 1 (feast not named); 3. vii. 2

[1] *Commentaire sur le N. T.*, t. ii., 1863.

(Tabernacles); 4. x. 22 (Dedication); 5. xii. 1 (Passover). Besides the disadvantage already referred to, of effacing the line of demarcation so distinctly traced by the evangelist himself between chaps. xii. and xiii., this division has the further defect of converting into a sort of appendix that whole important part of the narrative which is anterior to the first feast-journey, i. 19–ii. 12.

M. F. de Rougemont, in his translation of Olshausen's *Commentary*, 1844, has described the plan which, so far as the distinction and ordering of the parts goes, appears to me to come nearest to the truth: 1. Jesus attracts to Himself those who "do" the truth, i.–iv.; 2. He reveals Himself to the world, which rejects Him, v.–xii.; 3. He manifests Himself fully to His disciples, xiii.–xvii.; 4. He dies after having finished His work, xviii., xix.; 5. He rises again, and becomes through the Holy Ghost the source of life to believers, xx. The only defect in this arrangement seems to me to lie in the name which it gives to the contents of certain parts, and in the absence of a distinct logical relation between them.

The foregoing review has exhibited three principal factors in the narrative of our Gospel: Jesus, faith, and unbelief; or, to define more exactly: the manifestation of Jesus as the Messiah and Son of God; the birth, growth, and perfecting of faith in the disciples; the parallel development of national unbelief. De Wette, Schweizer, and Baur have shown us in their plans the chief example of three divisions founded solely or mainly on one of those factors. But those attempts have all failed. We have seen those frames break down in succession through the impossibility of including in them this or that part of the narrative; a fact which is easily explained if our Gospel is a work of a really historical nature. A rational framework applied to history must always have something artificial about it, and betray its insufficiency on some side. Fact must always pass beyond the ideal, because it includes the incalculable element of liberty. If, then, renouncing synthetical divisions, which are connected more or less with the view that the fourth Gospel is essentially a work of reason, we ask the book itself to give the secret of its internal arrangement, we find the narrative dividing itself into five groups, exhibiting a very natural gradation, which

the plans indicated above have successively brought to light:

1. i. 19–iv. The *manifestation of our Lord* as the Messiah; and as a subsidiary subject, the birth and first developments of faith, and the first hardly-perceptible symptoms of unbelief.

2. v.–xii. The powerful and rapid development of national *unbelief*, unfolding itself, however, on the basis of the growing revelation of Jesus as the Son of God, and advancing side by side with the development of the faith of the disciples, which is getting confirmed and rooted by means of those struggles.

3. xiii.–xvii. The energetic and decisive development of *faith* in the disciples during the last hours which they passed with their Master; and that by means of the highest revelations of Jesus, and in consequence of the expulsion of that disciple in whose person unbelief had till then maintained its footing, even in the bosom of the chosen circle.

4. xviii., xix. The consummation of national *unbelief* in the murder of the Messiah, contrasting with the calm shining of the glory of Jesus athwart that gloomy night, as well as with the silent growth of faith in the few disciples whose eyes were able to admit those mild glories.

5. xx. (xxi.) The appearances of the Risen One, which, as supreme revelations of Jesus, consummate the victory of *faith* over the last remains of unbelief in the apostolical college.

Exegesis will show whether this summary of the narrative is in conformity with the text and spirit of the writing. If it is so, the three chief elements which we have named will be unfolded simultaneously and face to face with one another in every part of the narrative, with this difference, that while the first — the revelation of Jesus — forms the permanent basis of the narrative, the other two arise alternately, the one with an ever purer brilliancy, the other in more and more sombre hues, on this common background. Faith is born, i.–iv.; unbelief prevails, v.–xii.; faith reaches its relative perfection, xiii.–xvii.; unbelief is consummated, xviii., xix.; faith reaches its perfection, xx. (xxi.)

There is in the arrangement of the Gospel, as we have understood it, nothing systematic, nothing factitious. It is the photography of history. If exegesis establishes the reality of this plan, which is at once so natural and profound,

we shall find in the fact an important confirmation of the really historical character and the seriously practical aim of our Gospel.

Imagine a spring day with the sun rising in a bright sky. The ground, moistened with the snows of winter, greedily absorbs his warm rays; everything which is capable of life awakes and is renewed; nature travails. Yet, after some hours, vapours rise from the damp earth; they unite and form an obscure canopy. The sun is veiled; a storm is threatened. The plants, under the impulse which they have received, nevertheless accomplish their silent progress. At length, when the sun has reached the meridian, the storm breaks forth and rages; nature is given over to destructive powers; she loses for a time her quickening star. But at eventide the clouds disperse; calm is restored; and the sun, reappearing in more magnificent brilliancy than that which attended his rising, casts on all those plants—the children of his rays—a last smile and a sweet adieu.—Thus, as it appears to us, the work of St. John is developed. This plan, if it is real, is not the work of theological reflection; it is the product of long-contemplated history. Conceived in the calm of memory and the security of possession, it has nothing in common with the combinations of metaphysical labour or the subtle calculations of ecclesiastical policy.

CHAPTER II.

ON THE PRESERVATION OF THE TEXT.

The text of our Gospel has been preserved, in whole or in fragments, in three kinds of documents: *manuscripts, ancient versions,* and quotations of the *Fathers.*

I.

The Manuscripts.

The manuscripts (MSS.) are divided into two great classes: —those which are written in uncial letters called *majuscules* (Mjj.), and those in which we meet with the rounded and

cursive writing which has been in use since the tenth century of our era, the *minuscules* (Mnn.).[1]

I. The *majuscules* having acquired a sort of individual value in critical science, and having been raised to the rank of real personages, it is of importance to form a particular acquaintance with each of them. To facilitate the study of the reader, we shall divide them into three groups: 1. The *vetustissimi;* those, namely, which date from the fourth and fifth centuries, the patriarchs. 2. The *vetustiores,* ascending to the sixth and seventh centuries. 3. The *vetusti,* or simple veterans, the products of the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries. They are designated, since the time of Wetstein, by means of the *majuscule* letters of the Latin, Greek, or even Hebrew alphabets.[2]

The *first* group comprehends at present four MSS., more or less complete, and four documents which are altogether fragmentary.

1. *Cod. Sinaiticus* (ℵ); at St. Petersburg; discovered by Tischendorf on the 4th February 1859 in the monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai; dating, according to this learned author, from the first part of the fourth century; according to others,—Volkmar, for example,—from the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century; written, probably, at Alexandria; retouched by several correctors. It contains our Gospel without a blank. Published by Tischendorf, Leipsic 1863.

2. *Cod. Vaticanus* (B); dating, according to Tischendorf, from the middle of the fourth century; probably written in Egypt; containing our Gospel without a blank. Published by Tischendorf, *Nov. Test. Vaticanum,* Lipsiæ 1871.

3. *Cod. Ephraëmi* (C), No. 9 of the Imperial Library of Paris, *rescriptus;* according to Tischendorf, of the first part of the fifth century; written, probably, in Egypt; retouched in the sixth and ninth centuries. In the twelfth century the text of the New Testament was effaced to give place to that of the works of Ephrem, a Father of the Syrian church. The ancient writing has been recovered by chemical means, but this manuscript still presents considerable blanks. Of our Gospel, only

[1] We do not speak here of *Evangelistaria* and *Lectionaria,* embracing the contents of such pieces of the Gospels and Epistles as were set apart for regular reading in public worship.

[2] We shall employ the signs adopted by Tischendorf in his eighth and last edition of 1872.

the eight following passages have been restored: i. 1–41, iii. 33–v. 16, vi. 38–vii. 3, viii. 34–ix. 11, xi. 8–46, xiii. 8–xiv. 7, xvi. 21–xviii. 36, xx. 26 to the end of the Gospel.

4. *Cod. Alexandrinus* (A); at London; of the second half of the fifth century; written, probably, at Alexandria. One blank only in our Gospel: vi. 50–viii. 52.

5. Seven palimpsest fragments (I) found in Egypt by Tischendorf; dating from the fifth and sixth centuries, and containing of John's Gospel some passages of chaps. iv., xi., xii., xv., xvi., and xix.

6. Fragments brought from an Egyptian monastery (I^b); at London; dating from the fourth or fifth centuries, according to Tischendorf; containing of John some verses of chaps. xiii. and xvi.

7. A palimpsest fragment (Q); of the fifth century, according to Tischendorf; found in the Wolfenbüttel Library; containing of our Gospel the two following passages: xii. 3–20, xiv. 3–22.

8. Some fragments of a *Cod. Borgianus* (T); at Rome, fifth century (Tischendorf), containing, parallel with the Egyptian translation called the Sahidic, the two passages: vi. 28–67, vii. 6–viii. 31.

The *second* group is more meagre. It contains only one MS. and five fragments, or collections of fragments.

9. *Cod. Cantabrigiensis* (D); at Cambridge; of the middle of the sixth century (Tischendorf); although filled with Alexandrine forms, it has no doubt been written in the West, and probably in Southern Gaul (Bleek, *Einl.* p. 707). Parallel with the Greek text there is found a Latin translation, earlier than that of Jerome. Two great blanks in our Gospel: i. 16–iii. 26, xviii. 13–xx. 13.

10. A palimpsest fragment (P); at Wolfenbüttel; of the sixth century; containing three passages of our Gospel: i. 29–41, ii. 13–25, xxi. 1–11.

11. Fragments of a splendid manuscript (N), four leaves of which are found at London, two at Vienna, six at Rome, thirty-three at Patmos; of the end of the sixth century (Tischendorf); containing of John: xiv. 2–10, xv. 15–22.

12. Fragments obtained by Tischendorf from the *Porphyri* Library ($\Theta^{c \text{ and } g}$); of the sixth century; passages of chaps. vi. and xviii.

13. Some fragments (T^b); at St Petersburg; of the sixth century; passages of chaps. i., ii., and iv. of our Gospel.

14. Marginal annotations (F^a) in the *Cod. Coislinianius* of

Paul's Epistles (H–202 of the Imperial Library of Paris); containing some verses of John from a text of the seventh century (v. 35 and vi. 53, 55).

The *third* group is the most considerable: it contains eleven MSS. more or less complete, and fragments of six others.

15. *Cod. Basileensis* (E); at Basle; of the eighth century; it appears to have been used in public worship in one of the churches of Constantinople; it contains the entire Gospel of John.

16. The beautiful Paris Cod. (L); of the eighth century; it wants only xxi. 15 to the end.

17. Fragments of a Cod. of the Barberini Library (Y); of the eighth century; containing of our Gospel: xvi. 3–xix. 41.

18. *Cod. Sangallensis* (Δ); written in the ninth century by the Scotch or Irish monks of the monastery of St. Gall; entire, except xix. 17–35. This Cod. contains an interlined Latin translation, which is neither that of Jerome nor the version anterior to that Father.

19. *Cod. Boreeli* (F); at Utrecht; of the ninth century; containing of our Gospel: i. 1–xiii. 34, but with numerous blanks.

20. *Cod. Seidelii* (G); brought from the East by Seidel; at London; of the ninth or tenth centuries; two blanks: xviii. 5–19 and xix. 4–27.

21. A second *Cod. Seidelii* (H); at Hamburg; of the ninth or tenth centuries; some blanks in ix., x., xviii., and xx.

22. *Cod. Cyprius* (K); at Paris; of the ninth century; brought from the island of Cyprus to the Colbert Library; entire.

23. The Cod. of *des Camps* (M); at Paris; of the ninth century; presented to Louis XIV. in 1706 by the Abbé of des Camps; entire.

24. Fragments of a Cod. from Mount Athos (O); at Moscow; of the ninth century; containing i. 1–4 and xx. 10–13.

25. A fragment from the library of Moscow (V); of the ninth century; containing i. 1–vii. 39.

26. A Cod. brought from the East by Tischendorf (Γ); at Oxford and St. Petersburg; ninth century; containing iv. 14–viii. 3 and xv. 24–xix. 6.

27. A Cod. brought from the East by Tischendorf (Λ); at Oxford; ninth century; entire.

28. Fragment of a Cod. (X); in the University Library at Munich; containing passages of i., ii., vii.–xvi.

29. A Cod. brought from Smyrna by Tischendorf (Π); ninth century; entire.

30. A Cod. of the Vatican (S); of the year 949; entire.
31. A Cod. of Venice (U); of the tenth century; entire.

Thus we have our Gospel in thirty-one documents in uncial letters, entire, almost entire, or wholly fragmentary. The oldest of those MSS., it is well known, bear almost no trace of accentuation, punctuation, or separation of words and periods. These different elements were introduced into the text gradually; and that is one of the means which serve to determine the age of the manuscripts. We dare not therefore allow those elements of the text any sort of authority.

II. There are reckoned more than five hundred *minuscules* deposited in the different libraries of Europe. All have not yet been collated. Though they are all more recent in origin than the Mjj., some of them may nevertheless have been copied from documents which had a text anterior to that which the latter reproduce. Some occasionally offer very remarkable readings; witness the Cod. 63 (Tisch.), which alone exhibits the omission of John xxi. 25, now supported by the Cod. Sinaïticus.

II.

The Old Versions.

The translations (Vss.) have the disadvantage that they do not present the text of the New Testament directly, but leave it to be conjectured. Yet they, too, can render important services to the criticism of the text, especially when the question relates to the omission or interpolation of words and passages, and the more so as many of them are much earlier than our oldest manuscripts.

There are two of them which, for critical importance, excel all the others: the ancient Syriac translation called *Peschito*, and the old Latin translation which, from a passage of St. Augustine, has received the name of *Itala*.

I. Peschito (Syr.).

This translation (the name of which seems to signify the *simple*, the *faithful*[1]) goes back certainly to the second century

[1] Tischendorf thinks otherwise. See Bleek, *Einl.* p. 720; and J. B. Glaire, *Intr. hist. et crit.*, 1862, t. i. p. 187.

of our era, and seems from the first to have had an ecclesiastical destination. It is in general what its name indicates, faithful without servility. When necessary, it sacrifices the idiom of the Syriac language rather than depart greatly from the original text. The principal edition, that quoted by Tischendorf, is the edition of Leusden and Schaaf, 1709 and 1717 (Syr^{sch}). Cureton, from a Syrian manuscript of the fourth century found in an Egyptian monastery, has published fragments of a translation of the Gospels which contain the following passages of John: i. 1–42, iii. 6–vii. 37, xiv. 11–28 (Syr^{cur}).

There is another Syriac version, made at the beginning of the sixth century; it is called the *Philoxenian* translation (Syr^{p}).

II. Itala (It.).

Long before the time of St. Jerome, and probably from the middle of the second century, there existed a Latin translation of the New Testament. It was even more necessary in proconsular Africa than in Italy, where the Greek language was better known. It is probable, therefore, that it was composed here and spread from this province. It appears to have been slavish to excess, and extremely rude. It existed in very varied forms. We possess several copies of those old Latin versions, first in bilingual manuscripts; as to the Gospel of John, the only one which contains it is Cod. D, the Latin translation of which is designated by d; then in particular manuscripts, such as the *Vercellensis*, of the fourth century (a); the *Veronensis*, of the fourth or fifth centuries (b); the *Colbertinus*, of the eleventh century (c), etc.

About the end of the fourth century, St. Jerome entered upon a work of revision in relation to this ancient translation, similar to that which, in the Syrian church, produced the Philoxenian translation. He corrected the version in use by ancient Greek manuscripts. This translation, the *Vulgate* (Vg.), is preserved in several documents of high antiquity, but which are far from being always in harmony with one another, or with the presently authorized form of this important version; for example, the Cod. *Amiatinus* (am.) and the *Fuldensis* (fuld.), both of the sixth century.

Of the other ancient translations, the most interesting for critical use are the three *Egyptian* versions: the *Sahidic* (Sah.), in the dialect of Upper Egypt; the *Coptic* (Cop.) translation, in that of Lower Egypt; and the *Baschmuric* (Bas.) translation, in a third dialect, which Champollion the younger supposed to be that of Fayoum. What gives those versions a special interest is, first, their date (middle or end of the third century); and next, their intimate relation to the text of our oldest Greek manuscripts.

III.

The Fathers.

The quotations from the New Testament contained in the writings of the Fathers have been called "Fragments of ancient manuscripts." This definition is inexact, except when the author intends to quote textually. Very often, the Fathers quote from memory, or merely according to the sense. The most interesting authors, so far as criticism of the text is concerned, are Irenæus (Ir.), Clement of Alexandria (Clem.), Tertullian (Tert.), Origen (Or.), Chrysostom (Chrys.). We shall often have to collate the readings of Origen with those of the oldest Greek MSS.; and from the relations existing between them, we may have to draw some conclusions which are not without importance as bearing on the normal reconstruction of the primitive text. The readings of the heretics, and particularly (in so far as concerns our Gospel) of Heracleon, have also a certain value.

IV.

The above remarks, as much abridged as possible, will suffice to put readers who have not yet busied themselves with the criticism of the text in a position to understand that part of our commentary which refers to this essential branch of exegesis, and to render accessible to them the great edition of Tischendorf (8th, 1872), in the notes of which there is concentrated the result of immense labours.

Since the time of Bengel, it has been an established point that the critical documents tend to form themselves into groups with a considerable measure of regularity. Thus, in Paul's Epistles, if we take a list of variations with an indication of the authorities on which the different readings rest, it is enough to run over a few pages to discover easily three groups of documents which sometimes follow each their own way, again unite two against one, sometimes also proceeding in unison. In the Gospels, those opposite camps tend to reduce themselves to two. But the strife is permanent; it is

reproduced almost at every verse. These are, on the one side, among the Mjj., B C L X;[1] among the vss., the Coptic translation; and among the Fathers, most notably Origen; on the other, among the MSS., the Mjj. E F G H K S U V Λ, and almost the entire body of the Mnn.; and among the Fathers, frequently Chrysostom. The other authorities: ℵ A D M Γ Δ Π, Syr. It., oscillate between those two parties; some inclining more habitually to one of the texts, the others towards the opposite text.

As the text presented by the authorities which are comprehended in the second of those two groups appears to be that which had prevailed in the churches of the Greek Empire, it is called *Byzantine;* while the opposite text, reproduced in the most ancient Greek MSS., evidently originating from Alexandria, has received the name of *Alexandrine.*

The question, then, which will present itself at every step will be this: to which of the two texts the preference is to be given. It is true, this is no longer a question in the eyes of many exegetes and critics; to hear them, it would seem that only ignorance or prejudice can still defend the Byzantine text. The editions of Lachmann and the work of M. Rilliet (introduction and translation) exhibit the climax of this tendency. Notwithstanding, Matthæi, Scholz, Rinck, and Reiche have undertaken, both in general and in a multitude of particular instances, to defend the Byzantine text. It is well known that this text is almost the same as that which is commonly called the *Received text* (T. R.).[2] For the Byzantine documents being the first which came into the hands of those who edited the New Testament after the discovery of printing, it was this text which accidentally prevailed in ordinary use, until the labours of Mill, Bengel, Wetstein, Griesbach, etc., having brought to light the readings of the opposite text contained in the oldest Greek MSS.,

[1] How does M. Rilliet (in his translation of the N. T. from the text of the *Cod. Vaticanus*, p. xxxiv.) arrange the MS. X in the other class? X proceeds almost constantly along with B C L.

[2] The sign ϝ (the Greek *st*), used by Tischendorf to designate the T. R., is used from the fact that it is in general the same as that of the large edition of Robert Stephen, *Stephani tertia*, of 1550. In the 145 to 150 passages where the reading of Stephen differs from the Received text (that of the Elzevir editions of 1624 and 1633), the latter is specially designated by ϝ^{e}.

a reaction took place against the Received text, and the balance inclined decidedly to the side of the Alexandrine text.

Is the question of superiority finally resolved? Can it even be settled in a general and absolute way? I cannot help doubting if it can. We are at this moment under the sway of a reaction; and it is the common fate of reactions to "pass beyond the truth." When we see Meyer, despite his evident prejudice in favour of the Alexandrine text, forced by his good exegetical sense to give the preference, by several relapses so to speak, in every chapter to the Byzantine reading; when we see Tischendorf himself, in his edition of 1859, previously to the discovery of the Sinaiticus, restoring to his text a multitude of Byzantine readings which he had discarded in preceding editions in favour of Alexandrine variations; when one has himself practised exegesis for a certain time, and has been obliged at every instant to recognise in the text of the MSS. B C L traces of arbitrary corrections arising from the grammatical purism of the Alexandrine literati,[1]—he feels that he must abstain from every *à priori* principle, and that substituting one prejudice for another would not be to advance science.

And is it not really a prejudice to imagine, as the learned ignorance of some does at the present day, especially since Tischendorf's recent good fortune, that the most anciently copied text is therefore the most ancient and pure? As if the epoch of the transcription of a text were the real date of the text! Does not a MS. of the tenth century copied from a document of the second present an older text than a MS. of the fourth century transcribed from a document of the third? Besides, the date of the original MS. is not even in this question the chief matter. The really grave question is as to the degree of confidence with which the copyist regarded the document which he was transcribing. If he copied it with docility, without arrogating the place of corrector and censor, the chances of alteration were infinitely reduced. But if the previous knowledge which he believed himself to have of the alterations which the text had undergone filled him with dis-

[1] Griesbach's good faith had already extorted from him the confession, "*Grammaticum egit Alexandrinus censor*" (Preface to his 2d edition).

trust of his model, there was no limit to the errors which his hardihood might commit. A transcription made in the fourth century under such conditions will be much more faulty than a copy executed in the tenth in a spirit of confiding simplicity.

I am free to believe, for my own part, that those suppositions are not altogether so gratuitous as might appear at first sight. It is neither from the fourth nor the fifth century that alterations of the text of the New Testament date. Origen complained of them bitterly even at the beginning of the third.[1] He complained at Alexandria itself, where the evil was consequently not less, but where it was probably more considerable than anywhere else. And yet it is to MSS. copied in that very city, and later than Origen by at least a century, that we are to attribute a superiority raised above all discussion!

But, it will be said, has not the Cod. Sinaiticus come to confirm in a striking way the superiority of the Alexandrine text? To have the enormous importance attributed to it by Tischendorf; and to merit the applause with which its appearance was hailed, this document would require to be anterior to the age when alterations were introduced into the text. Otherwise, what have we in this codex? A new witness to the already known Alexandrine text. May we not apply here the judicious observation of Griesbach: "Produce the same actor twenty times on the stage, with as many different costumes and names, he will yet be always the same person"? Let five or six documents more of the same kind be found, older than the Vaticanus and even the Sinaiticus, the question will not thereby be decided. What would be more decisive, would be the discovery of a document of the Greek text anterior to the period when the beginning of alterations can be established.

To sum up, there are only three suppositions possible: Either the Alexandrine text is on the whole the simple and natural reproduction of the primitive text, while the Byzantine

[1] *In Matth.* t. xv.: "It is evident that great diversity has been introduced into the manuscripts, either by the carelessness of certain copyists, or by the blameworthy audacity which has led some to correct the texts, or through the fault of those who allowed themselves to add or retrench what seemed to them good."

is the result of a gradual accommodation to the literary tastes which prevailed at Constantinople, and in the churches dependent on that metropolis; or the Byzantine text is the docile and simple transcription of the apostolic text, while we have in the Alexandrine text, with its continual abbreviations, the result of a work of correction in which the exegetes and grammarians of that capital of the scientific world thought themselves entitled to indulge, having to do with a text which they distrusted; or, finally, both suppositions are simultaneously true, and are realized, the one in one case, the other in another. . . . I do not pronounce. I merely ask of the reader an impartial and attentive study of the context in every particular case. All I wish by these reflections is, to keep open the question which there is an apparent wish to close, and to claim entire liberty in the discussion of details.[1]

[1] We are happy to be able to quote in favour of our view the authority of Bäumlein: "No one class of manuscripts can be named whose readings absolutely deserve the preference" (*Comment. über d. Ev. Joh.* 1863, p. 1); and that of the eminent English critic Scrivener, who, after a profound and lengthened study of all the documents, lays down as a first principle of criticism: the impossibility of restoring the original form of the N. T. by consulting *only one class* of manuscripts, and demonstrates this proposition by enumerating a series of errors in the two most ancient manuscripts, the Sinaiticus and the Vaticanus. We had already maintained this view vigorously in our first edition.

THE TITLE OF THE GOSPEL.

THE title appears in the MSS. in different forms. The simplest is that which we find in ℵ B D: *κατὰ Ἰωάννην* (*according to John*). The most of the Mjj. and ℵ have (at the end of the book); *εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ἰωάννην, Gospel according to John;* T. R., with a very large number of Mnn., *τὸ κατὰ Ἰ. εὐαγγ., the Gospel according to John.* Stephen's third edition adds *ἅγιον* (*holy*) before *εὐαγγ.*, with several Mnn. Some Mnn. read, *ἐκ τοῦ κ. Ἰ. εὐαγγ.* The vss. also vary: *evang. Johannis* (Syr.); *ev. per Joh.* (Goth.); *ev. secundum Joh.* (Cop.); *ev. sanctum prædicationis Joh. præconis* (following certain editions of Syr.).

All these variations sufficiently prove that the title does not come from the hand of the author or editor of the Gospel. Had it belonged originally to the body of the work, it would be the same, or nearly so, in all the documents. It was undoubtedly added when the collection of the Gospels took place in the churches. Now, the forming of the Gospel collection came about more or less spontaneously in each locality, as is shown by the different arrangement of our four Gospels in the canons of the churches. The differences in the title are explained in the same way.

But what is the exact meaning of the phrase: "*according to John*"? From the time of the Manichean Faustus (Augustine, *contra Faustum*, xxxii. 2) down to our time, there have been learned authors who have given to *κατά, according to*, a very wide sense: Gospel compiled *according to the type of preaching* followed by Matthew, John, etc. So MM. Reuss (*Gesch. der heil. Schr. N. T.*, § 177) and Renan (*Vie de Jésus*, p. xvi.).[1] The consequence would be, that those four phrases,

[1] These phrases merely signify that such were the traditions emanating from each of those apostles, and resting on their authority.

instead of attesting, would rather exclude the complete authenticity of our Gospels. But the authors of those titles would thus have contradicted themselves; for no one in the primitive church ever assigned to those four writings any other authors than those who are named in the titles,—a fact which holds good independently of certain particular traditions which, like that of Papias in reference to St. Matthew's Gospel, seem to contradict it. Besides, this meaning, *according to*, would not at all apply to the second and third Gospels; for Mark and Luke had never been regarded as the founders of a peculiar and independent tradition, but merely as the compilers of those which emanated from Peter and Paul. The title of those two writings should therefore have been: Gospels *according to Peter* and *according to Paul*, if, in reality, the word *according to*, in the mind of the authors of the titles, had had the meaning ascribed to it by the critics whom we are combating.[1] Their error arises from their giving to the term *gospel* a meaning which it had not in the language of primitive Christianity, and which it only received in the course of the second century. In the still living and spiritual language of the New Testament, this word never designates a *book*, a writing relating the Saviour's coming, but the *glad news of God* to man, consisting in that coming itself; comp. for example, Mark i. 1; Rom. i. 1. The meaning of the titles is not therefore: "a book compiled according to the tradition of"..., but: "the blessed advent of Jesus Christ related by the care or the pen of"... It would not have been possible, in this sense of the word *gospel*, to say as we now do, "John's Gospel;" the ellipsis was rather: "the Gospel *of God*." Besides, we find the preposition κατά used by Diodorus of Sicily to denote the author himself when he calls the work of Herodotus: "The History according to Herodotus" (ἡ καθ' Ἡρ. ἱστορία), or by Epiphanius (*Haer.* viii. 4) when he says: "The Pentateuch

[1] We are not forgetting that, as to Mark's Gospel, there is assumed between our present Gospel and the immediate tradition of Peter, a writing now lost, which was Mark's real work, and formed the foundation of our second Gospel, and that thus the sense in which the "according to Mark" is taken is preserved. But, at least, there is no such hypothesis regarding Luke's Gospel; and whatever may be the authority of the critics who at the present day defend the hypothesis of a *Proto-Mark*, we believe that it rests on very precarious grounds (see our *Comment. on St. Luke's Gospel*, vol. ii. pp. 437–440).

according to Moses (*ἡ κατὰ Μωϋσέα πεντάτευχος*)." M. Reuss cites the title of the apocryphal gospel *εὐαγγ. κατὰ Πέτρον*. But it is very clear that the author who wished to pass this gospel under the name of Peter sought to ascribe the compilation of it to the apostle, and so gave to the word, *according to*, the same meaning as we do. As to the well-known phrases, *εὐαγγ. κατὰ τοὺς δώδ. ἀποστόλους, καθ' Ἑβραίους, κατ' Αἰγυπτίους* (according to the Twelve Apostles, the Hebrews, the Egyptians), it is evident that in these cases *κατά* denotes either the entire ecclesiastical circle from which those writings were judged to proceed, or that circle in the bosom of which they passed current.

PROLOGUE.

I. 1-18.

EACH evangelist enters upon his subject in the way which corresponds best to the spirit of his narrative. Matthew, whose purpose is to demonstrate the right of Jesus to the theocratic throne, begins with His genealogy. Mark, who compiles memorabilia, throws himself without exordium *in mediam rem.* Luke, who purposes to write a history properly so called, gives account to his readers of his sources, aim, and method. The prologue of John ought to be equally in keeping with the general viewpoint of his narrative. But to determine this relation requires the profound study of that remarkable piece which more than any other passage of our holy books, perhaps, has exercised a decisive influence on the conception of Christianity in the church down to our own day.

How far does the prologue extend? Only to ver. 5, answers M. Reuss. According to this view, the narrative would begin at ver. 6: "*There was a man whose name was John.*" This mention of the birth of John the Baptist would be followed at ver. 14 by the mention of the incarnation of the Word; then the reference to the ministry of John the Baptist (ver. 19) would bring the narrative down to the beginning of the ministry of Jesus Christ (ver. 35).

But a glance at vv. 15 and 16–18 is enough to prove that this arrangement does not at all correspond with the thought of the evangelist. The testimony of John the Baptist recorded at ver. 15 comes in on this supposition either too late (comp. vv. 6–8) or too soon (comp. ver. 19 et seq.). More than that, it would form an intolerable tautology with the double repetition of the same saying in vv. 27 and 30. It is in the two latter passages that the declaration of the forerunner is placed in its historical position,—that it is, properly speaking, *nar-*

rated. In the first, it is simply *quoted,* and that from an entirely different point of view from that of history, with a didactic aim. The dogmatical or religious reflections contained in vv. 16–18 would be equally out of place if the narrative had already begun. Finally, ver. 18: "*The only-begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father*" . . ., so evidently forms the pendant of ver. 1, that we must recognise in it the closing of the cycle opened at ver. 1. The narrative, then, does not begin till ver. 19, and vv. 1–18 form a whole of a particular kind.

Is there a plan in this prologue? Or does it only contain a metaphysical lucubration or a pious effusion, without any definite course or rational progress?

Lücke and some moderns maintain two parts: 1. Vv. 1–5. The *primordial* existence of the Logos. 2. Vv. 6–18. His *historical* appearance. In this way the coming of Christ in the flesh would undoubtedly be mentioned twice at vv. 11 and 14; but as it is taken up, it is said, more profoundly the second time than the first, there is no repetition properly so called. This reply, it must be confessed, is somewhat subtle.

Olshausen and Lange maintain three sections: 1. Vv. 1–5. The *primordial* activity of the Logos. 2. Vv. 6–13. His activity under the *Old* Testament. 3. Vv. 14–18. His incarnation and activity in the *church.* In this way the order of historical progress would be rigorously observed by the evangelist. But the point in question is, whether this plan is compatible with the expressions of which he makes use, particularly whether the words of vv. 11–13 really allows us to apply this passage to the time of the Old Testament.

Luthardt and Hengstenberg contend, not for chronological sections, but for concentric cycles, reproducing, when taken together, a summary of the Gospel history, each time with some new development. 1. Vv. 1–5. The summary of the activity of Christ, comprehending His coming in the flesh, and the general ill success of His ministry. 2. Vv. 6–13. The same history, with special mention of the forerunner and the delineation of Jewish incredulity. 3. Vv. 14–18. The same fact once more, but presented more specially from the standpoint of the blessings it brings to believers.—The study of the details is the only thing which can furnish us with the means of appreciating this plan.

Hoelemann, in a little work full of erudition, *De evangelii joh. introïtu*, etc., Leipsic 1855, has endeavoured to trace the plan of the prologue by following out, in a more thoroughgoing way than is ordinarily done, the parallelism between this piece and the first chapter of Genesis. He succeeds perfectly in the outset. But when he seeks to bring into correspondence the words: "*The light shineth in darkness*" (ver. 5), with the separation of the light from the darkness (Gen. i. 4); or these: "*There was a man*" . . . (ver. 6), with the creation of man (Gen. i. 26); or when he comes to seek the explanation of the saying: "*This was the true Light*" (ver. 9), in an allusion to the appearance of the sun on the fourth day (Gen. i. 16),—it is impossible to follow him in his subtilties; and such exaggeration makes us the more admire the wisdom of the evangelist, who, after proceeding for a little in a line parallel with Moses, knew his time for stopping short.

In all the proposed divisions, it will be seen that the first four or five verses form a first section. The general theme of this passage is evidently the Logos, His existence, and His activity previously to the incarnation. The last words of ver. 5: "*The darkness comprehended it not,*" clearly form the transition to a new idea, the rejection of the Word from the bosom of humanity. This second idea reaches its culmination and limit in ver. 11: "*He came unto His own, and His own received Him not.*" Here begins a contrast precisely marked by δέ (*but*), the only adversative particle of the prologue; whence, accordingly, we have the point of departure for a third idea,—that of faith in the Logos, indicated at the beginning by the first words of ver. 12: "*But to them who received Him.*" The development of this idea extends to the end of the prologue. Thus, then, the Word, unbelief, and faith, such appears to us to be the plan of the piece. The interpretation of the details will show whether this view of the whole corresponds to the thought of the evangelist.

We defer to the close of the prologue the study of the general questions bearing upon it.

FIRST SECTION.

VV. 1–4.—THE LOGOS.

The allusion to the beginning of Genesis in the first verses of our Gospel, is obvious at a glance. But John does not stop at that *beginning* which Moses made the point of departure. He ascends still higher. Why so? Because his aim is more remote than his predecessor's. To reach further, one must start higher. The Jewish historian had immediately in view only the development of the theocracy; the evangelist's aim is the second creation—Redemption. For him the beginning of Moses does not suffice. He must plunge into eternity to find there the agent of the work which he proposes to describe. He starts from the same point as Moses, the ἀρχή, the *beginning* of the world and of time; but instead of proceeding onward, he goes backward. He seeks in God Himself the subject of his history—the Word (ver. 1); having found Him, he takes his place with Him again at the beginning of things (ver. 2), and so again descends the stream of time. He brings before our eyes, first, the act of creation (ver. 3); then the normal and primitive state of humanity (ver. 4); and that while continuing to make the Logos the sole subject of his narrative.

Ver. 1. "*In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.*"[1]—If it is indisputable that the phrase: *in the beginning*, contains a reflective allusion to *Bereschith*, the first word of Genesis, it follows that it refers to the time of creation. Some modern expositors (Olshausen, de Wette, Meyer) apply it to eternity, in so far as it is the *origin* of time. Meyer quotes Prov. viii. 23: ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸ τοῦ τὴν γῆν ποιῆσαι, "*from the beginning, or ever the earth was.*" With still more probability we may quote 1 John i. 1: "*That which was from the beginning,*" and Rev. iii. 14, where Jesus is called: "*The beginning* (the principle) *of the creation of God.*" Nevertheless, the sense *beginning* may be maintained in the first two passages; and from the fact that *principle* is the only meaning applicable in the third, it does not follow

[1] L and Gregory of Nyssa read ὁ before θεός.

that it should be applied here, where the word beginning is used absolutely (without addition), and has nothing else to determine it than its parallelism with the well-known opening of Genesis. Ver. 2, at which St. John, after having plunged into the eternal order, again returns to this point of the beginning to relate the act of creation (ver. 3), proves that the meaning which we prefer is really that which corresponds to his thought.—As to the significations "Eternal Father," or "Divine Wisdom," given by some Fathers (Origen, Cyril of Alexandria), or "beginning of the preaching of the Gospel," essayed by the Socinians, they are no longer maintained by any one. But if the notion of eternity is not contained in the word *beginning*, it arises from its relation to the verb *was*. "In the beginning *was* the Word," signifies that when everything began it did not begin; it was there already anterior to all created things, and to time itself, which is only the space wherein created things are developed. Now, what is anterior to time belongs to the order of eternity. Thus the argument by which M. Reuss (*Histoire de la théol. chrét.*, t. ii. p. 439) seeks to prove that the absolute eternity of the Word is not contained in John's words, falls to the ground. "If," says he, "the *in the beginning* of the fourth Gospel establishes the absolute eternity of the Word, the *in the beginning* of Genesis will establish the absolute eternity of the world." By no means; for the relation of the words *in the beginning* to the imperfect *was* in John, is entirely different from the relation of the *in the beginning* of Moses to the perfect *created* (Gen. i. 1). In the former case, the beginning is a special point of time which emerges on the permanent basis of the *was;* in the other, the beginning coincides with the instantaneous act: God created.—As to the term *Logos* (*Word*), it must necessarily, in this context, contain an allusion to the history in Genesis. Eight times in the narrative of creation there occur, like the refrain of a hymn, the words: "*And God said.*" John gathers up all those *sayings* of God into a single *saying*, living and endowed with activity and intelligence, from which all divine orders emanate; he finds as the basis of all spoken words the speaking Word. Those resound in time; this is above time. This parallelism with Genesis would suffice to set aside the meaning of *reason*, which some

theologians of modern times have attempted to give to the word Logos, as if it were meant to designate the *consciousness* which God has of Himself. This rag of Hegelian logic does not suit the text of the evangelist. The word *Logos* means *reason*, only in the language of philosophy; in the New Testament, it never signifies anything else than *word*—reason as it expresses itself in discourse. Theodore Beza thought that λόγος, *word*, might signify here ὁ λεγόμενος, the *Promised One*, the personage announced by the prophets. This impossible interpretation has been presented most recently in a somewhat less intolerable form by Hofmann and Luthardt: the Gospel preached to humanity, of which Christ is the essence; the evangelic message personified in Jesus. But let the attempt be made to apply this meaning in ver. 14: "The subject of the evangelic revelation was made flesh;" or in ver. 2: "The subject of gospel preaching was in the beginning with God!" All Luthardt's efforts have not succeeded in removing the forced character of this meaning.

Again, it has been sought to give to the word Logos an active signification. Schleussner explains it as ὁ λέγων, *auctor*; τοῦ λόγου, the *preacher* of the Gospel. But then, instead of a striking contrast, the term would become only a cold tautology in the saying, "*The Word was made flesh!*" The only form in which this explanation can be seriously discussed, is that given by Neander (*Gesch. der Pflanzung*, etc., 3d ed. t. ii. p. 689): *the eternal revealer of the divine being.* There is in the divine essence a principle by which God reveals Himself, the Logos, and a principle by which He communicates Himself, the Spirit. It is the former which is at work in the divine *saying*, Gen. i., as well as in all the theophanies and prophetic revelations of the Old Testament. It is the same which is the subject of the gospel history. We shall see how far this idea suffices to explain the different propositions of John regarding the Logos.

The three propositions of this verse are brief, having a deeply marked character like oracles. The first indicates, as we have just seen, the *eternity* of the Logos; the second expresses profoundly the idea of His *personality*. Such, indeed, is the meaning of the words πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, *with God*, which could not well be rendered, as it seems to us, either by

one or other of the recently proposed translations: *toward God* (Astié), or: *in the presence of God* (Bonnet, Arnaud, Rilliet). The first is not English; the second is not exact. The latter would correspond to the entirely different expression, *παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ* (comp. *παρὰ σοί, in Thy presence,* xvii. 5). *Πρός* expresses *proximity;* but combining with that notion that of drawing near, it indicates an active relation—a felt and personal communion. The real translation would be: "The Word was *in relation with* God," and it would be best, therefore, to preserve the old form: "The Word was *with* God." The simplest explanation of John's phrase is got from Gen. i. 26: "*Let us make* man in *our* image, and after *our* likeness." It is to this intimate counsel in the depths of the divine being that this second proposition of the apostle alludes, as the first referred to Gen. i. 1. We may be astonished to find a preposition indicating motion (*πρός*, with the accusative *toward*) in connection with the verb of rest *was.* The same case reappears at ver. 18: *ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον.* Other examples may be quoted of a like construction in our Gospels. This form is meant here to express a *state,* the essence of which is *motion,* relation, action; comp. the use of *πρός*, 2 Cor. v. 8; Gal. i. 18. It is obvious how impossible it is to admit the Socinian interpretation maintained by some modern theologians: "The Word was eternally *in the divine understanding* or *plan.*" John's words cannot designate a divine intuition. The object of the eternal motion of the Logos is God, *ὁ Θεός.* This term, especially in Greek, proves that God is God in a complete way, independently of the Logos, and that therefore the latter cannot designate the consciousness which God has of Himself, or the divine reason. The accus. *τὸν Θεόν* shows God actively corresponding to the aspiration of the Logos. The whole expression denotes, on the one hand, the subordination of the Word; on the other, the full communion of God with Him.

We are now in a position to establish the insufficiency of the explanation of the Logos proposed by Neander. If the expression, *the word,* included only the idea of revelation outwardly, John must have ascribed to the Logos a motion toward the world rather than toward God. Evidently, in the mind of the evangelist, the tendency of the Logos *ad extra,* as it will manifest itself

in the works of creating and enlightening the world (vv. 3–5), rests on an anterior and essential relation *ad intra*. To reveal God, one must know Him; to project Him outwardly, one must have plunged into His bosom. The character of revealer is therefore subordinate, even in the Logos, to a personal communion with God, in which He receives the perfect and primordial revelation, and whence He will draw all His revelations to the world. If He makes the divine glory shine forth outwardly, it is because He is filled with it inwardly. He contemplates before reflecting, He receives before giving.

The distinction of persons, so strongly emphasized by the second proposition, is in the third resolved into a community of essence: "*And the Word was God.*" Though placed first, Θεός, *God*, is certainly the attribute. The subject of the proposition can be nothing else than the Word; for the question in the prologue is not who is God, but who is the Word. If the word God is placed first in the phrase, it is because this ascription is the word in which is expressed the climax to the preceding propositions (comp. x. 33). John does not say ὁ Θεός (as in the reading of two authorities), for thereby he would be ascribing to the Logos the totality of divine existence, which would identify the Logos and God, and contradict the preceding proposition. As little does he say θεῖος, "The Logos was *divine*,"—an expression which would efface the boundary between God and what is not God, and contradict Monotheism. The word Θεός, *God*, used as an attribute, simply expresses the notion of kind. It is an adjective which, while maintaining the personal distinction between God and the Logos, ascribes to the latter all the attributes of the divine essence, in opposition to every other essence which could have been assigned Him, either angelic or human. The conjecture of the Socinian Crell, Θεοῦ ἦν ὁ λόγος, "The Word belonged *to God*," has no critical foundation, and offers no appropriate meaning.

The third proposition of ver. 1 was the height of the climax, and this height was so great that it could not be surpassed. Accordingly the thread is broken, and no logical particle connects ver. 2 with ver. 1. With this mysterious and divine being, whom John has just discovered in eternity, he now returns to

the threshold of time, to the beginning, to pass thence to creation, as the transition to redemption:

Ver. 2. "*This same was in the beginning with God.*" Ver. 2 combines the three elements of the three propositions of ver. 1 in a single one; the pronoun οὗτος, "this being such as I have just defined Him, this Word-God," reproduces the third proposition; ἐν ἀρχῇ, *in the beginning*, the first; and πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, *with God*, the second. This complex phrase, by assigning to history as its principle the being whom St. John has discovered in eternity, exhibits Him clothed with all the riches of the divine attributes, in virtue of which He shall be able to accomplish the divine operations which are to be ascribed to Him in the sequel. Οὗτος, *this same*, therefore, by no means contains the antithesis supposed by Meyer, "This same, and other being" (comp. *all things*, ver. 3)—an explanation to which, no doubt, is to be traced the unhappy translation of M. Rilliet, "*It is He who* was in the beginning," etc. Such a contrast is wholly groundless. The words, *was in the beginning*, serve to point to Him as anterior to the fact of creation, of which He is to be the agent; the words, *with God*, refer to the divine decree which He is proceeding to execute. Thus it is that ver. 2, summing up ver. 1, lays the foundation of all that is affirmed in vv. 3 and 4.

Ver. 3. "*All things were made by Him; and without Him was not anything made that was made.*"[1] There is in the idea of Word the double notion of knowledge and will, and consequently of wisdom and force. It is in virtue of those attributes, received here to the full height of divine perfection, that the Word can fill the creative function which is ascribed to Him, ver. 3. Everything—the existence of things, and the order which guides them—proceeds from Him. Hence the bond which links Him so closely to created beings, especially to man, His privileged work (ver. 4), and hence that which makes way for His incarnation and His redeeming office (ver. 14). Πάντα, *all things*, differs from τὰ πάντα, *all (the) things*, inasmuch as the second indicates a special and deter-

[1] D and some Fathers and Gnostics read οὐδὲν instead of οὐδὲ ἕν. The Gnostics, Heracleon, Ptolemæus, and others, the Alex. Fathers, Clem., Or., as well as C D L, It. Vulg., put a point after ἕν and connect ὃ γέγονεν as subject with the following phrase.

mined totality (2 Cor. v. 18), while the first is necessarily unlimited. The word γίνεσθαι, *to become*, indicates the passage from nothingness to being, and forms a direct contrast to the *was* of vv. 1 and 2. Comp. the similar antithesis, viii. 58: "*Before Abraham was* (came into being), *I am*." It is the contrast between the two orders—the temporal and eternal. The part of the Logos is designated by διά, *by*. This preposition does not lower the Word to the rank of a simple instrument; it is often applied to God Himself (Rom. xi. 36; Gal. i. 1; Heb. ii. 10). But it limits His part so as to leave place for a relation between God and the world, different from that of the Logos. This relation is not mentioned here; but it is expressed by St. Paul, 1 Cor. viii. 6, by the prepositions ἐκ, *of*, and εἰς, *for*: "*To us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we for Him*." Paul adds, in perfect conformity with our passage: "*And one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom* (δι' οὗ) *are all things, and we by Him* (δι' αὐτοῦ)." Every being, to reach existence, must have passed through the thought and will of the Logos. But He Himself draws everything from the Father, and refers everything to the Father. This limitation of the part done by the Word was already implied in the words: *with God* (vv. 1 and 2). Since there is community of action, there is distinction of office.

The second proposition of the verse, while repeating the same in a negative form, is intended to exclude all exception. The words, *without Him*, forcibly declare the entire community expressed above between God and the Logos,—the "*let us make*" of Genesis. Some moderns—Lücke, Olshausen, de Wette, and Bäumlein—think that by the words, *not anything*, John means to set aside the Platonic idea of eternal matter (ὕλη). But, first, matter would not be a ἕν; rather it is the undetermined condition of every particular being; and, second, matter in the ancient sense is not a γεγονός, a *thing which has become*; John's expression would therefore not apply. It is more arbitrary still to ascribe to the apostle here, with Scholten, the notion of an eternal matter from which the Logos derived the world. Where in the text is there to be found a trace of such an idea? In general, the apostle does not philosophise; his sole aim is to exhibit the supreme grandeur of the being who is to accomplish the work

of our redemption; He who becomes our Saviour was the divine partner in the work of creation. Every being, even the tiniest insect and the smallest blade of grass, took their origin through His mediation, and bear the mark of His wisdom and power. In our translation we have connected the words 6 γέγονεν, *that which exists*, with the preceding proposition, and not with the phrase following. This is the prevalent interpretation since the time of Chrysostom. The exegesis of ver. 4 will justify this exposition. It was probably the apparent tautology of the words ἐγένετο, *took origin*, and ὃ γέγονεν, *that which exists*, which led the oldest Fathers to connect the latter words with ver. 4. Some modern interpreters can only explain these words as "a redundancy peculiar to John's style." But this view falls to the ground as soon as we seize the relation between the perfect (present) γέγονεν and the aorist (past) ἐγένετο: "There is not in this whole creation *which exists before our eyes* (ὃ γέγονεν), a single being which *was not formed* (ἐγένετο) by the Word." Therein we see neither redundancy nor tautology.

The Word is not only the principle who brings beings out of nothingness into existence; He is also the source of life to them all when they have been once created:

Ver. 4. "*In Him was*[1] *life; and the life was the light of men.*"[2] The authorities who connect ὃ γέγονεν, *that which exists*, with ver. 4, understand either: "That which exists was life in Him," or, "That which exists in Him was life." The two senses are equally inadmissible; first, for a grammatical reason: the perf. γέγονεν, referring to a present existence, does not agree with the imperf. *was;* it was no doubt the feeling of this disagreement which led to the reading ἐστι, *is*, which we find in the Sinait. and Cantab.,—a reading accepted by Tischendorf, but which is evidently a correction; second, for the more decisive reason that ζωὴ εἶναι, *to be life*, is too strong an expression to be applied to creatures. The true description would have been ζωὴν ἔχειν, *to have life in* . . . The subject of *was* is therefore the word ζωή, *life*. And as this word has no article, and should therefore be taken in the most indeterminate sense, it should be translated, not as is generally done: "In Him was

[1] ℵ D It^plerique Syr^cur read εστιν instead of ην.

[2] B omits in the text των ανθρωπων (supplied on the margin).

the life," but as we have done: "In Him was life." *Life*, not for the Word Himself,—for the description of the Word in His essence is finished, and this idea would bring us back to ver. 3, —but for the universe created by Him. There is a gradation from the *by Him*, ver. 3, which referred to the creative act, to the *in Him* (ver. 4). This last expression means that the world, after having passed from nothingness to being by the power of the Word, continued to draw from Him the vivifying forces necessary for its preservation and progress. After having been the root of the tree, the Logos was also its sap. The term *life* is understood by Calvin and other interpreters as referring to the physical preservation of things in the sense in which it is used by Paul, Acts xvii. 28: "*In God we live and move and have our being.*" Others, like Lampe, Hengstenberg, etc., apply it to spiritual and eternal life. The distinction does not appear to us applicable to this passage; ζωή, *life*, denotes here existence in its full state of prosperity, in its normal expansion. Now, for certain beings, the normal development of existence is limited to physical life; for others, it rises to intellectual and moral life; the latter may even become capable of receiving supernatural or eternal life. "In union with the creative Word, John means to say there was life, full life, the perfect development of existence, for each being according to its measure, and consequently also for the whole." This idea of *life*, taken with that of *creation* (ver. 3), forms a gradation corresponding to that which we have remarked between *in Him* (ver. 4) and *by Him* (ver. 3).

Does the imperf. *was* refer to a real period of history, and to which? Brückner and Hengstenberg see in it only the expression of an ideal possibility. The former: If man had continued in union with the Word, the Word *would have been* his life. The latter: The Word alone *could* give life, so that, till the coming of Christ, the creature was debarred from access to spiritual life. Undoubtedly this interpretation is not wholly devoid of truth; it is the ideal relation between the Word and humanity which is described in this verse. But if this relation had never *begun* at least to be realized, John could not have expressed himself as he does here. Such a purely hypothetical sense would not be in harmony either with the force of the imperfect, which denotes a real point in a period

of indefinite duration, or with the historical character of all the preceding verbs. These words, therefore, necessarily refer, according to John's view, to a real period of history. Now, from the connection of ver. 4 with ver. 3, this period can be no other than that which immediately succeeded the act of creation. The subject in question, therefore, is that first spring-time during which the Word, meeting as yet with no obstacle in the universe, could make it fruitful by communicating to it, according to the capacity of each of those beings which composed it, the riches of His own life. This magnificent starting-point in a development soon broken revealed the normal state, the essential relation.

The normal state described in the first proposition found its highest expression in the being who was the masterpiece of creation, viz. man. In this privileged creature, made in the image of the Word Himself, *life* developed in the form of *light*.—The word *light*, according to Calvin and others, denotes *understanding*, that characteristic which distinguishes man from the lower animals; according to Hengstenberg, on the contrary, it is *salvation*; Luthardt would make it *holiness*. The first meaning does not answer to the fulness of John's language; when he says: "*God is light*" (1 John i. 5), he certainly does not mean: "*God is reason.*" *Salvation* is undoubtedly set forth in Scripture under the emblem of light; but neither does this meaning apply, for it would here lead to a complete tautology with the term *life*. The meaning *holiness* is equally defective, because it is impossible to exclude from the term light the element of knowledge. This profound word appears to us to denote, in the language of John, the knowledge of moral good, or moral good fully conscious of itself in the living beings who realize it. The word *truth* in John expresses the same thing without a figure. Light, thus understood, is accessible to no being on the earth except man, the one being endowed with the inner organ necessary to perceive moral good. That organ, originally one, but now divided, is the sense which we call conscience and reason.

This light did not emanate directly from the Word: it proceeded from life, that life which man derived from the Word. For as bodily sight is one of the functions of physical life, so, in the normal state, spiritual light is an emanation from moral

life. The Logos is light; but it is through the mediation of life that He must become so always; this is precisely the relation which the gospel restores. We recover, through the new creation in Jesus Christ, an inner light which springs up from the life, and which gains in clearness in proportion as the moral life grows in intensity. This idea is forcibly expressed by the article *ἡ, the,* which John introduces in the second member before the word *life.* In communion with the Word there was life, normal existence for the world; and from that universal life there sprang up light in man (by vocation the being of light). Our Lord meant nothing else when He described the pure heart as the organ which sees God (Matt. v. 8).

In such a context is it not natural, whatever Meyer may say, to see in the two words: *life* and *light,* and in the relation which John establishes between them, an allusion to the tree of life and to that of knowledge? After having eaten of the former, man would have been called to feed on the second. John initiates us into the real essence of those primordial and mysterious facts, and gives us in this verse, as it were, the philosophy of paradise.—Some interpreters have applied ver. 4 to the action of the Logos in the midst of the theocratic people by means of prophecy. But the words *τῶν ἀνθρώπων, of men,* demand for the passage a universal human application. The two imperfects, *was,* by placing in the past, and to some extent in the ideal sphere, the vivifying and light-giving communication of the Logos, already awake the suspicion that the present reality no longer corresponds to that normal relation. This comes out more clearly still from ver. 5, which forms the transition between the preceding section and that which follows. The latter treats of the *unbelief* of humanity in regard to the Logos, who reveals Himself to mankind.

SECOND SECTION.

VV. 5–11.—UNBELIEF.

The fact of unbelief is indicated summarily in ver. 5. Then John relates the extraordinary provision which God made for its prevention, the sending of the forerunner, vv. 6–8.

Finally, he describes the fact itself in such a way as to unveil its enormity, vv. 9–11.

Ver. 5. "*And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not.*"[1] What, then, came to pass? What is the moral revolution implied in the transition from ver. 4 to ver. 5, and especially by the term *darkness?* Did not all obscurity seem to be for ever excluded by what is related in ver. 4? Here John evidently assumes, on the part of his readers, an acquaintance with the fact of the fall, by which the organic bond between the Logos and humanity, described in the preceding verse, was broken. As in vv. 1–3 he alluded to Gen. i., and in ver. 4 to Gen. ii., he refers here to the account given in Gen. iii., and speaks of humanity such as it became by the invasion of sin.

This is the meaning of the expression: *the darkness.* After ver. 4, this term can evidently not designate a kingdom of evil co-eternal with that of good, as alleged by critics who, at any price, wish to make our author a dualistic philosopher. Such a system, besides, would not harmonize with the thoroughly universalistic expression of ver. 7: "That *all* men through Him might believe."—The term: *the darkness,* ver. 5, thus denotes humanity, from the time when the relation described in ver. 4 was altered. True moral light disappeared from among mankind with life, and life with the introduction of sin. From the time that this vital condition: "*in Him* (the Word)," no longer exists, humanity (*men,* ver. 4) becomes like a branch separated from the stem, and consequently deprived of sap. Instead of the growing knowledge of the true and good which results from communion of life with the Logos, there arise those vain phantoms to which the passions give birth, and which are entertained by an imagination ruled by evil. Comp. Rom. i. 21, 22. They take the place of the pure and holy views with which the spiritual life proceeding from God filled the heart of man in innocence. Yet, says John, in the very heart of this humanity given over to moral darkness, the Word shines. But what is the fact referred to by the verb *φαίνει, shineth?* This question has received two very different answers. According to that which we adopted in the first edition of this work, John speaks here of that

[1] B and five Mnn. read *αυτην* instead of *αυτο.*

inner revelation with which the Logos continued to enlighten humanity from the time of the fall to the coming of Jesus Christ. Undoubtedly, it is no longer, as in ver. 4, a light emanating from life. It is the Logos Himself performing a first extraordinary act of mercy towards sinful humanity, to cause to shine still in the heart of each of its members the ideal of the good, the just, and the holy, *the law written in the heart*, as St. Paul says, Rom. ii. 14, 15. According to this explanation, the following proposition: "*And the darkness comprehended it not*," would refer to the blindness of fallen humanity in not submitting to this inner light, but plunging into the ever thickening night of paganism. During those long ages, not one was found who did not to some degree extinguish the innate revelation which proceeded from the Logos.[1] In favour of this explanation there might be alleged the present φαίνει, *shineth*, which indicates a permanent state, a continuity; also the very natural relation which it establishes between vv. 5 and 4; finally, the parallelism of the idea expressed here with the first and perhaps the third proposition of ver. 10: "He (the Word) *was in the world*... and the world *knew Him not*."

Nevertheless, a constantly renewed study of the question has led us to abandon this explanation, and to prefer that which explains the φαίνει, *shineth*, by the historical appearance of Jesus Christ; and the words: "*The darkness comprehended it not*," by the rejection of the gospel on the part of the majority of mankind estranged from God, and especially of the mass of the Israelitish nation. The chief reasons in favour of this second meaning appear to me to be the following: 1. The very remarkable *asyndeton*[2] between vv. 5 and 6. And this form always indicates an emotion strong enough in the writer to break the external concatenation of the discourse; it thus displays a deep bond of feeling. The fact mentioned in ver. 6 must consequently be in the most intimate connec-

[1] The theory of the famous λόγοι σπερματικοί is well known, which was the foundation of the Apologetics of the Alexandrine school. We should have here the principal *dictum probans* of this dogma.

[2] This name is given when there is no particle used to indicate the logical relation between the two propositions which follow one another. The Greek language has such a wealth of particles of this kind, that such an omission is always significant.

tion with the general idea expressed in ver. 5. Now there is no connection between the rejection of the inner revelation of the Logos during pagan times and the coming of John the Baptist, while there is a very close one between his coming and the rejection of the light which appeared in Jesus Christ. This first reason would appear to us to be in itself decisive. 2. The saying of Jesus in conversation with Nicodemus, iii. 19, 20: "*Light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil*" ... is not this the true commentary on ver. 5 of the prologue? Now there is no doubt as to the meaning of this declaration of Jesus. 3. The parallel in 1 John ii. 8: "*The darkness is past, and the true light now shineth,*" presents to us the same verb in the same tense (*φαίνει, shineth*) applied to the historical appearance of Jesus and the preaching of the gospel.—Thus, ver. 5 should be regarded as the summary of all that follows down to ver. 11, and ver. 6 as opening the development of those contents. So there is a perfectly adequate reason for the *asyndeton* between vv. 5 and 6.—As to the connection of ver. 5, thus understood, with ver. 4, it must not be sought in anything which passed on man's side, since from this point of view the two verses are separated by all the interval between paradise and redemption. It must be found in the person and office of the Logos, who, appearing in Jesus as the revealing light for the sin-benighted world (ver. 5), thus discharges the function which corresponds to His essence and His original relation to men (ver. 4).—Moreover, the idea of an essential relation between the Logos and every human soul is not lost by the fact of this explanation. It remains as the basis of ver. 4, and will actually reappear in ver. 10.—The expression: "*The darkness comprehended it not,*" may appear too absolute. But comp. iii. 11, 19, and 32: "*Ye receive not our witness;*" "*men loved darkness rather than light;*" "*no man receiveth His testimony.*" All these declarations only indicate the general fact; and those who speak thus are so far from excluding individual exceptions, that these are immediately specified (vv. 15, 18, 21, 33). It is the same in the prologue; comp. vv. 12, 13 with 16.—May it not have been the seeming exaggeration of the expression (ver. 5) which led some Fathers (Origen, Chrysostom) to give to the word *κατα-*

λαμβάνειν an unfavourable sense: *hold back, restrain:* "The darkness could not *extinguish* this light"? In any case, this meaning is inadmissible. The proper term to express this idea would have been κατέχειν (Rom. i. 18). The word κατα-λαμβάνειν, *to put the hand upon,* is used to denote the distinct apprehension of an idea or fact. Comp. Acts x. 34; Eph. iii. 18. This, the most usual sense, is the only natural one here; comp. the parallels: "*knew Him not,*" "*received Him not,*" vv. 10 and 11.—Instead of the copula καί, *and,* it seems as if there should be between the two propositions of ver. 5 the adversative particle δέ, *but.* This is only in appearance. The author does not mean to indicate a contrast. The operation of the word holds on its way independently of human resistance (comp. Introd. p. 190).

Meyer endeavours to conjoin the two chief interpretations of the passage, and to apply our verse to the revealing action of the Logos both *before* and *after* His incarnation. Such a combination of two ideas at once so heterogeneous and important is impossible. We cannot unite under the same expression (φαίνει) the inner revelation of the Logos in the human soul and His appearance on the stage of history; and as little can we find, under the single expression οὐ κατέλαβεν, *comprehended not,* the rejection of the first and of the second revelation. We must decide between the two.—How did the rejection of the revealing light which shines in Jesus come about? John answers this question in the verses which follow down to the eleventh. The scope of the passage is to bring out the full gravity of the fact.

Ver. 6. "*There was* (*appeared*) *a man sent from God, whose name was John.*"—It seemed as if the divinely accredited forerunner must have rendered impossible that unbelief in the Logos which was about to follow.—The term ἐγένετο, *became, appeared,* denotes a historical appearance; thus forming a contrast—is it intentional?—with the verb ἦν, *was,* which denoted the eternal existence of the Word. It is the same with the word ἄνθρωπος, *a man,* which forms an antithesis to the divine subject, which is as yet the only one on the scene. The analytic form, ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος ἀπεσταλμένος, is not a simple periphrasis of ἀπεστάλη, as Chrysostom thought. The *appearance* of such a one as John has an importance of its

own which is naturally enhanced by that of his *mission*.—In regard to the term *sent*, comp. iii. 28: "But that I am *sent* before Him;" and Mal. iii. 1, from which this expression seems to be taken.—The name *John* (*God shows grace*) in itself announced the era which was about to open. But this is not the reason why the evangelist mentions it here. It is as if he said simply: "He of whom I speak is the man whom you all know under the name of John."

It is remarkable that our evangelist uses simply the name of John, without adding the epithet *Baptist*, which had become inseparable from the name, as appears from the Synoptics, and even from the Jewish historian Josephus.[1] Is not Meyer (Introd. p. 31) right in concluding from this omission that the author of our Gospel must have known the forerunner otherwise than by tradition? But for that, he would certainly have designated him by using the full title received in the church. If, on the contrary, he knew him before the public voice applied to him the surname, it is quite natural that he should describe him briefly as he does here. Besides, Credner has remarked, that as the title Baptist served in the church to distinguish the forerunner from another John not less celebrated, the evangelist, if he was that other John, must avoid employing the title, lest he should indirectly draw attention to his own person.—After having introduced this personage, the author describes his part:

Ver. 7. "*The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the Light, that all through Him might believe.*"—The pronoun οὗτος, *the same*, sums up all the data of the preceding verse, as the οὗτος of ver. 2 summed those of ver. 1. The verb ἦλθε, *came*, differs from the verb ἐγένετο, *appeared*, ver. 6, inasmuch as the latter applied to the birth of John, while the former denotes his entrance upon public life.—The part of *witness* has such importance in the eyes of the evangelist, that he presents it in two ways; first, without government: *as a witness*, or (more literally) for *witness-bearing;* the second time, by indicating the subject of the testimony. The first expression exhibits the *characteristic* of witness in itself, in opposition to the more eminent person who is to follow. The second completes the notion of his witness-bearing.

[1] "John surnamed the Baptist." *Antiq.* xviii. 5. 2 (see Introd. p. 257).

This idea of *witness-bearing* is one of the fundamental notions of our Gospel. It is inseparable from that of *faith*, and correlative with it. Witness-bearing is rendered with a view to faith, and faith is only possible in virtue of witness-bearing. There is no faith worthy of the name except that which is fixed on a divine testimony rendered either in act or in word. Witness-bearing resembles the vigorous trunk of the oak; faith, the slender twig which embraces the trunk and makes it its support. But did the light need to be attested, indicated, demonstrated? Is not the sun its own proof? If the Word had appeared here below in the glory which is peculiar to Him (*the form of God*, Phil. ii. 6), the sending of a witness would not have been necessary. But He must appear enveloped in a thick veil (*the flesh*, ver. 14). In the state of blindness into which sin has plunged man, he cannot discern Him under this form except by means of some testimony. "To bear witness to the Light," says John, "*that all through Him might believe*,"—evidently, believe on Christ through John the Baptist, and not on God through Christ (Grotius, Ewald, etc.).—The matter in question in this verse is not the part of Christ, but that of John.—When some modern critics accuse one another of agreeing with the Gnostics in setting up two kinds of men of opposite natures, origins, and destinies, the psychical and the pneumatical, they seem to forget the words: "that *all* through Him might believe."—As at ver. 3 John had coupled his affirmation with a negation to sweep away expressly every notion contrary to the truth affirmed, so he does here:

Ver. 8. "*He was not the Light, but was sent to bear witness of the Light.*"—The emphasis is not, as Meyer thinks, on the verbal idea: "He *was not* the Light, but only a witness." The emphasis is on the subject (Luthardt): "It was not *he* who was the Light, but another (ver. 9)." Hence the choice of the pronoun ἐκεῖνος, substituted for the οὗτος of ver. 7. The latter has only an affirmative force; the former has always in John something of stronger emphasis, and even exclusiveness.—The ἵνα, *in order that*, depends, according to Meyer, on an understood ἦλθε (*came*), or is, according to Luthardt, independent of any verb, as is often the case in John (ix. 3, xiii. 18, xv. 25). But this independence can never be more than apparent,—an

aim must depend on some action. And if it is hardly natural to go so far back as the verb ἦλθε, *came* (Meyer), there is nothing to prevent us from using the verb ἦν, *was*, strengthening its meaning a little: "was *there*" (*aderat*), and making it the point of support for the *in order to*.

It can hardly be admitted, I think, that in this verse John means only to give expression to the feeling which he had of the absolute superiority of Jesus to John the Baptist (Meyer, Hengstenberg). The emphatic negative form of ver. 8, and the analogous passages, i. 20, iii. 25 et seq., compared with Acts xiii. 25, and with the remarkable fact related, Acts xix. 3, 4, lead us to suppose a polemical intention against parties who attributed to the forerunner the dignity of the Messiah (comp. Introd. p. 293).

John's testimony should have opened the door of faith to all, and rendered unbelief impossible. And yet the impossible was realized, and that, too, in the most monstrous form. This is the fact which is developed in vv. 9–11.

Ver. 9. "*That was the true Light, which lighteth every man coming into the world.*"—This verse may be construed in three ways: either by isolating the verb ἦν, *was*, from the participle ἐρχόμενον, *coming*, and connecting this latter with πάντα ἄθρωπον, *every man*; or by connecting this participle directly with the verb *was* (*was coming*, equal to *came*); or by taking it as in apposition, and forming one of the dependent explanations of *was*.

Adopting the first construction, we may make τὸ φῶς, *the Light*, the subject of *was*. "The true Light, which lightens every man coming into the world, was present" (ἦν). That is to say, that at the time when John announced Jesus, the Light (in Jesus) was already on the scene. This is Meyer's interpretation. But, 1. Where would be the very great importance of the fact thus signally marked? And, 2. How, with such a context, could the appendix, *coming into the world*, joined to *every man*, be regarded otherwise than as superfluous? Finally, 3. This special meaning of ἦν, *was present*, is not well grounded in this phrase, where the verb *to be* is immediately followed by its natural attribute.—While following this first construction, I was led, in my first edition, to a somewhat different sense. Borrowing the subject of the phrase from the

preceding verse, I gave this translation: "This Light (to which John gave testimony, ver. 8) was the true Light which enlightens every man coming into the world." It was a repetition of the idea of that inner revelation wherewith the Logos illumines every human conscience, as I found expressed in ver. 5. In this sense the appendix, *coming into the world,* was by no means superfluous. The meaning was: every man receives this light as his birth-gift *at the very moment when he enters into life.* The reasons which lead me to abandon this construction and interpretation are: 1. The striking antithesis between the words: "*coming* into the world," ver. 9, and "*was* in the world," ver. 10. The writer wishes to make the contrast prominent: The Word came into the world, and yet He was already there! Thereafter it is perfectly natural to repeat the fact of the *coming* (ἦλθε), ver. 11. 2. The usual and almost technical application of the words: *coming into the world,* to the appearing of Christ; iii. 19: "*The Light is come into the world;*" vi. 14: "*This is of a truth that prophet that cometh into the world* (ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον)," etc.—With the second construction different interpretations have been attempted: "The Light *was coming,*" that is to say, arrived at that very moment, or was on the point of appearing (alluding to the near ministry of Jesus); or: was certainly to appear according to the divine decree. But the evil of all those explanations which make *coming* the attribute of *was,* is their putting the emphasis on the participle, *coming into the world,* which is secondary in comparison with the principal attribute: *the true Light,* in which there comes out the contrast between John the simple witness, the preparatory light, and the Word, the essential light.—Thus we are led to a third construction. The subject must be taken from ver. 8: "That Light, in favour of which John bore witness." The attribute of ἦν, *was,* is then naturally enough: τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, *the true light.* Then we can take the words: *coming into the world,* in apposition to the attribute, *the Light,*—an apposition *parallel* to the subordinate proposition in the sense: "The true Light which lighteth every man, and which came into the world." And the words: *which lighteth every man,* might still refer to the inner illumination of the Logos. But it is more natural to connect the participle *coming* with the verb of the subordinate proposition,

φωτίζει, *lighteth*, with the meaning of a Latin gerund: "which lighteth every man, *by coming* (itself) into the world." In this case, the illumination of all men by the Word can only apply to the universality of the preaching of the Gospel by the historical appearing of Christ announced successively to every human being. Comp. the *all* of ver. 7. Such, we believe, is the interpretation in which we must rest. But whether this saying is applied to the inner revelation of the Logos or to His historical manifestation, it proclaims in either case a universalism which is incompatible with the dualism ascribed to our evangelist by the Tübingen School.

The word ἀληθινός, *true*, is one of those terms for which the Johannine style shows a peculiar predilection. It signifies in John, as in classical writers (see Meyer), not the *true* in opposition to the *false*, but the veritable (perfect) realization of the idea (here: the essential or absolute light) in opposition to all its imperfect manifestations (as in this case, the forerunner and the other divine messengers whom the world had seen down to the time of Jesus Christ).

But it must not be thought that the Logos who enters into the world arrived there as a stranger. Profound and intimate relations between Him and the world had preceded His historical manifestation.

Ver. 10. "*He was in the world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not.*"—The first proposition forms a contrast to the last words of ver. 9: "That Light, which cometh into the world, was already there." Here is the reproduction of the idea of ver. 4. Though the sin of man made a breach in the relations between the Word and the world, it did not banish Him from it. It is always *in Him* that "all things live and move and have their being." It is difficult to understand how exegetes like de Wette, Meyer, and Astié could refer the words, *He was in the world*, to the presence of Jesus in Israel at the time when the forerunner was preaching; and the last proposition, *the world knew Him not*, to the people's ignorance at that time of the presence of the Messiah (comp. ver. 26: *There standeth One among you whom ye know not*). What proportion is there between a fact of so little importance, and the idea of the following proposition, in which the Logos is described as the Creator of the

world! The declaration, *and the world was made by Him*, necessarily impresses on the proposition which precedes and on that which follows a character of grandeur and sublimity incompatible with so accidental a fact. If, on the contrary, the words, *He was in the world*, relate to the invisible and universal presence of the Logos before His incarnation, it is easy to understand the relation between this idea and the following one: *and the world was made by Him.* This second proposition recalls ver. 3 as the first does ver. 4. They form both of them a striking contrast to the third, which reproduces the idea of ver. 5.

Intimate as were the previous relations between that true Light and the world which it came to enlighten, *the world knew Him not.* It had been created by Him; He filled it, as the spirit of an artist fills his work; and yet when He came it did not recognise Him. The καί, *and*, which connects the third proposition with the two others, undoubtedly expresses a contrast, but imparting to it at the same time a progressive character. The work of the Logos continues; nothing disturbs His course; comp. the similar *and* of ver. 5. Let us remark here for the first time a peculiarity in the style of our evangelist. He loves the *paratactical* (by way of juxtaposition) construction so familiar to the Hebrews, and employs it instead of the syntactical conjunction of propositions, which corresponds to the genius of the Greek language. Instead of saying, "He was . . . *and* the world . . . *and* the world" . . . , a writer of Greek origin would have expressed himself thus: "*Although* He was . . . and *though* the world was made . . . the world knew Him not." The words: οὐκ ἔγνω, *knew Him not*, in connection with the first proposition, might certainly, notwithstanding our explanation of ver. 5, refer to the ignorance of the world in general in regard to the inner revelation of the Logos anterior to His coming in the flesh; comp. 1 Cor. i. 21: "After that, in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom *knew* not God . . .," and Rom. i. 19–21. The unbelief of the Jews, ver. 11, would in this case stand out as an exceptional fact on the general background of human blindness. In that case we must translate: "*Had not* known *Him.*" But if Paul is justified in charging the Gentiles with not having known *God*, could they be charged with not having

recognised the *Logos?* It is therefore more natural to apply the *knew not* of ver. 10 to the same fact to which we have referred the *comprehended not* of ver. 5, to the rejection of the Light which appeared in Christ on the stage of history. The word καταλαμβάνειν, *seize*, ver. 5, suited the Logos regarded as a luminous *principle* (αὐτό, neuter); the word *know, discern*, ver. 10, applies better to the Logos regarded in the light in which He appears here as a *person* (αὐτόν, masculine). We seize a principle,—we discern a person. The κόσμος, *world*, is here humanity blinded by sin, *the darkness* of ver. 5.

It will be seen that our ver. 10 sums up vv. 3–5, with the view of preparing for the description of the final catastrophe, ver. 11. In this verse there is indicated more expressly the agent by whose instrumentality the sinful world consummated this fatal act.

Ver. 11. "*He came into His own (dwelling-place), and His own received Him not.*" If the *knew Him not* of ver. 10 were applied to the rejection of the inward illumination of the Logos, this ver. 11 would form a climax to the third proposition of ver. 10: "There was something worse still!" But it is better, and it is the natural form of the *asyndeton* between vv. 10 and 11, to regard this last verse as a more emphatic repetition of the same fact as is indicated in the preceding. The expression passes from the abstract to the thoroughly historical and concrete form; and that in order to exhibit the full enormity of the fact.—The word ἦλθε, *came*, denotes an external manifestation, in opposition to the *was* of ver. 10, which expressed only an invisible presence. This *came* refers back to the ἐρχόμενον, *coming into the world*, of ver. 9. Τὰ ἴδια, literally, *His home* (comp. xix. 27). Before coming down to the earth, the Logos had prepared for Himself a dwelling-place which belonged to Him peculiarly, and which should have been as it were His door of entrance into the world. Comp. Ex. xix. 5, where Jehovah says to the Jews, "*Ye shall be my peculiar treasure among all peoples;*" and Ps. cxxxv. 4: "*The Lord hath chosen Jacob.*" Malachi had said of Christ, while describing His final appearing, His Messianic advent: "The Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come *to His temple;* behold, He shall come" (iii. 1). But this door was closed against Him, and that by those very men who

should have opened it to Him: *οἱ ἴδιοι, His own,* His servants, the dwellers in His house, whom He had Himself established in it. *Τὰ ἴδια, His dwelling-place,* was Canaan, with its entire theocratic institutions; *οἱ ἴδιοι, His own,* are the members of the Israelitish nation. So Paul calls them in like manner *οἰκεῖοι, members of the household, domestici, familiares,* in opposition to the *ξένοι* and *πάροικοι,* strangers and pilgrims, terms by which he denotes the Gentiles (Eph. ii. 19). Never, it seems, had the Jews better deserved this name of honour from Jehovah than when Jesus appeared. Their monotheistic zeal and aversion to idolatry had then reached their culminating point. The nation in general seemed to form a Messianic community, fully disposed to receive "Him who was to come," as a bride welcomes her bridegroom.—The word *παραλαμβάνειν, to receive to one's house,* perfectly expresses the nature of that welcome which the Messiah had a right to expect. It should have been a national, solemn, and official acknowledgment on the part of the entire nation, hailing its Messiah, and rendering homage to its God. If the abode prepared had opened in this way, it would immediately have become the starting-point for the conquest of the world (Ps. cx. 2, 3). Instead, an unheard of event took place. In Agamemnon returning to his palace after ten years' absence, and falling by the hand of his unfaithful spouse, we have the event which is tragical *par excellence* in pagan history. But what is that outrage when compared with the theocratic tragedy? The God invoked by the nation appears in His temple, and is crucified by His own worshippers!—Observe the finely-shaded difference between the two compounds, *καταλαμβάνειν, to apprehend,* ver. 5, which suited *the light* viewed as a principle, and *παραλαμβάνειν, to welcome,* which is the suitable term when the subject is the master of the house. On the *καί, and,* the same observation as at vv. 5 and 10. We feel that the heart of the writer is now calmly contemplating the poignant contrast contained in the two propositions of the verse.

Two explanations have been offered, opposed to that which we have been developing. Some interpreters, as Lange, for example, refer the coming of the Word in this verse to the manifestations of Jehovah and the prophetic revelations in

the Old Testament. Others—M. Reuss, for example—apply the words, *He came,* as we do, to the historical manifestation of Jesus Christ; but, according to them, the ἴδιοι designate, not the Jews, but "men in general, as creatures of the pre-existent Word" (*Hist: de la théol. Chrét.* t. ii. p. 476). M. Reuss even describes the application of the words, τὰ ἴδια, οἱ ἴδιοι, to the Jews, as "a strange error of ordinary exegesis." As to the first opinion, it is incompatible with the word ἦλθε, *He came,* as well as with vv. 12 and 13, which can only relate to the effects of Christ's coming in the flesh. No one would have thought of giving another meaning to ver. 11, but for the apparent tautology which arises from it with ver. 14. This is a difficulty which we shall have to surmount. The other interpretation, that of M. Reuss, appears to him necessary, because of a difficulty which he finds in the ὅσοι, *all them who,* of ver. 12, if by *His own,* ver. 11, the Jews are understood,—we shall examine this objection in its own place; and next, because of the general fact that, according to our Gospel, "there are no peculiar relations between the Word and the Jews as such." We think, on the contrary, we can prove that the fourth Gospel, no less than the first, recognises the existence of an organic relation between the theocracy and the coming of Christ in the flesh. Comp. i. 17: "*The law given by Moses*" is followed by "*grace and truth came by Jesus Christ;*" ii. 16, Jesus calls the temple "*His Father's house;*" iv. 22: "Salvation is of the Jews;" v. 39: "*The Scriptures testify of me;*" and, moreover, viii. 35, 56, x. 2, 3, xii. 41, xix. 36, 37. All these passages overthrow the assertion of M. Reuss, and justify the meaning which we have given, in keeping with the entire context, to the expressions *His own* (dwelling-place) and *His own.*

THIRD SECTION.

VV. 12–18.—FAITH.

Though the appearing of the Word did not succeed in scattering the darkness of the human race and overcoming the resistance of Israel as a nation, His mission is by no

means a failure. On the contrary, it is at this juncture that His relations to humanity become more intimate, and that a *new humanity* appears on the earth, begotten directly of God through the instrumentality of faith (vv. 12 and 13). The *object* of this faith, which has power to create a family of God's children here on earth, is the incarnation of the Word (ver. 14*a*). Extraordinary as this fact is, it is *certain;* for, 1st. He was *beheld* with rapture by eye-witnesses, to the number of whom the author belongs (ver. 14*b*); 2d. He was *pointed out* by the divine herald, whose mission it was to proclaim Him (ver. 15); 3d. He was *proved,* and, as it were, lived on, by the whole church, which, by everything received from this unparalleled being, Jesus Christ, proves that He has the characteristics of the divine Logos (vv. 16–18). Hence the threefold testimony: that of eye-witnesses, that of the official witness, and that of the whole church.

This third part of the prologue thus goes to demonstrate the certainty and riches of faith. Ver. 18 brings us, through the experience of believers, to that summit from which we gradually descended after ver. 1. The church possesses in Jesus that eternal Word,—that Word-God, with whose existence the prologue opened.

Ver. 12. "*But*[1] *as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, to them that believe on His name.*" Δέ, *but,* expresses not only gradation, but opposition. This is proved, first, by the antithesis of ἔλαβον, *received,* to οὐ παρέλαβον, *received not* (ver. 11); and it appears also from the contrast between ὅσοι, literally: *as many of them as there are who,* and οἱ ἴδιοι, *His own* (ver. 11). This latter name denoted the nation as a whole; the pronoun ὅσοι denotes only individuals. By its official representatives, the nation, as such, refused to welcome Jesus. From that time faith took a purely individual and, so to speak, sporadic character. This is expressed by the pronoun ὅσοι, *all those who.* Nay, more, in proportion as faith in the Messiah was detached from all identification with the Jewish nation as such, access to this faith was opened up to every human being. This is that impoverishment of Israel which, as St. Paul says (Rom. xi.), has formed the riches of the Gentiles. The ὅσοι are there-

[1] Δι is omitted by D and some Fathers.

fore not only those from among *the Jews* who have not shared the national unbelief, but *all believers* in general (*τοῖς πιστεύουσιν*, ver. 12*b*), whether Jews or Greeks,—all those whom John contemplates as gathered into one new people, when he says, at ver. 16: *ἡμεῖς πάντες, all we.* Thus is resolved the dilemma by which M. Reuss (*Hist. de la théol. Chrét.* t. ii. p. 475) thinks he can prove that the words *His own* (dwelling-place), *His own people* (ver. 11), designate men in general, and not Jews. If they were Jews, he alleges, the *all those* of ver. 12, who are contrasted with the *His own* of ver. 11, would be either Gentiles—and we should be led to the assertion that Gentiles alone believed—or the Jews who believed exceptionally, and we should be forced to conclude that there were no believers except Jews! The error is in this latter conclusion. The true inference to be drawn from this *all those* is, that the Messiah being once rejected by unbelieving Israel (that of ver. 11), there is henceforth in the *human race*, taken as a whole, only *individual* believers. This substitution of individual faith for the collective and national welcome of the chosen people, is the very reason why there is used in this verse the simple verb *ἔλαβον, received,* instead of the compound *παρέλαβον, welcomed* (ver. 11). The compound had a certain grave or solemn character, which was in keeping with an official reception, such as that of the Israelitish authorities receiving in the name of the whole theocratic nation its divine King, and bringing Him into His palace, viz. the temple; while the simple *λαμβάνειν*, which signifies *to take*, to seize in passing, and, as it were, accidentally, is more in keeping with the notion of individual faith. In this verse, therefore, St. John, like St. Paul in all his Epistles, substitutes the great idea of Christian individualism, with its universal and human character, for Jewish nationalism, with the narrow particularism within which it was naturally confined.

The antithesis between vv. 11 and 12 is dictated by the feeling of a grave contrast. The evangelist has not expressed the consequences of the tragical statement: "*His own received Him not;*" but every one knows that for Israel they are temporal ruin and spiritual death. This results from the fact that the Logos rejected by them was the Life. But John

desires to signalize the salutary and glorious consequences arising from the welcome given to the Word by individual believers of every nation. This divine guest conferred on those who received Him privileges that are worthy of Him. The apostle mentions two, the one of which is the condition of the other: a new position in relation to God, and in this new position participation in His perfect life.

The word ἐξουσία, authority, competency, can neither denote simple *possibility*, which is too little, nor *power*, which would be too much; for the believer cannot make himself a child of God. What is meant is a *new standing*, granted to the believer, that of a reconciled or justified one, in virtue of which he can receive the πνεῦμα, the Spirit of God, which is in Him the principle of a divine life. By the possession of this life he becomes τέκνον Θεοῦ, *a child of God*. The expression includes more than the idea of *adoption*, Paul's υἱοθεσία, which would rather correspond to the state of justification, the new standing denoted by ἐξουσία. The word τέκνον, *child*, from τίκτειν, *to beget*, implies the actual communication of the life of God; while the word υἱός, *son*, does not necessarily go beyond the idea of adoption, as a civil transaction, if one may so speak. Comp. Gal. iv. 6: "*Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts;*" a statement which amounts to saying: "Because ye are *sons*, υἱοί (by adoption), God hath made you *children* (τέκνα) by regeneration." The *because* of Paul is precisely equivalent to the ἐξουσία of John. How, with the word γενέσθαι, *become*, before his eyes, can Hilgenfeld venture to maintain that, according to the dualistic system of John, the children of God are such by nature, and before their acceptance of the historical Christ?

The idea, *child of God*, in the concrete sense which it has here, is foreign to the Old Testament. There, the terms *father* and *child*, in the rare cases where they occur (Ps. ciii. 13; Isa. lxiii. 16; Jer. xxxi. 20; Hos. xi. 1), express only the feelings of affection, tenderness, or compassion. This observation would suffice to set aside the explanation of exegetes who, like Lange, looking forward to ver. 14, refer vv. 12 and 13 to the faithful of the Old Testament. Expressions so strong, applied to Israelitish saints, would be in

contradiction to the declaration of Jesus, Matt. xi. 11, 12; they would not even be compatible with John i. 17 and vii. 39.

To denote the welcome given to Jesus by individual believers, the apostle had used the figurative and consequently less precise term, *receiving*. But a notion so important demanded an exact description; for the passage is an invitation to the readers to appropriate to themselves the same privileges; they must therefore know exactly in what way to do it. Hence the appendix: τοῖς πιστεύουσιν . . ., *to them that believe on His name*. These words indicate with precision the *mode* of the λαμβάνειν of individual reception. But instead of connecting them with the word ἔλαβον, *received*, which they explain, the author joins them to the pronoun αὐτοῖς, *to them*. "It is one of the peculiarities of John's style," observes Luthardt, "to describe the moral condition, by means of which an act is accomplished, by an explanatory appendix, added to one of the words which depend on the principal verb. As to style, this is perhaps clumsy; but as to expression of thought, it is energetic. See the same construction, iii. 13, v. 18, vii. 50, etc." We have sought to give the force of this turn of expression in our translation [Fr.: because of their having believed]. But we have not been able to do so without a measure of violence to the emphasis. The relation between the two acts, *receiving* and *believing*, is evidently this: the second fully suffices for the realization of the first. But why is faith needed to receive the Word? Because His divine character does not fall under the sense of sight. For a thick veil hides Him from our natural view. To discern Him, a spiritual act is necessary, an act of moral perception, accompanied by a sincere surrender to the Holy Being who is its object. Such is faith.

The term by which John here expressed the object of faith is ὄνομα, *the name*. This word, which occurs so frequently in Holy Scripture, may be understood in two ways. Either it denotes the entirety of the external signs and acts through which the person is revealed, itself remaining inaccessible to the senses; so it is understood by Hengstenberg. Or, on the contrary, as we think, the term *name* is the adequate expression of the inmost essence of the being, in opposition to its external

manifestations. In this latter case, *the name* is not the name which men give, but that which the being bears in the judgment of God, that which defines its true nature, its absolute name. The second meaning is the only one which is suitable in a passage where the *name* is given as the object of *faith*. The true name, which is not expressed here, is that of *Logos*, ver. 14, or *Son*, ver. 18. The apostle had developed the notion of *receiving* (in the last words of the verse), but not that of *children of God;* the latter he unfolds in ver. 13.

Ver. 13. "*Which were born,*[1] *not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.*"—The past, *which were born*, or, more literally, *which were begotten*, contains a difficulty. Is regeneration, then, anterior to faith (ver. 12)? Meyer replies that the relative *οἵ*, *who*, does not depend on the last words, *them that believe on His name*, but on the principal substantive: *children of God*, by a construction *ad sensum* (the masculine *οἱ* and the neuter *τέκνα*). And, in fact, ver. 13 is only the development, in a negative and positive form, of the idea: *child of God*. And first, in the negative form, by means of three cumulative phrases. Through their antithesis with the brief *ἐκ Θεοῦ*, *of God*, which follows, they take a disdainful or even contemptuous character. Does John mean thereby to stigmatize the false confidence of the Jews in their theocratic sonship, in their title, Abraham's children? But would not the accumulation of three phrases to express the idea of theocratic birth be superfluous? And has not the prologue too high a flight, too universal a bearing, to admit of so petty a polemic? Does not John rather wish to exhibit here the contrast between the first and second creation? In conformity with the essentially different character of the two creations, there are two humanities: the one which is propagated in the natural way, the other in which life proceeds from an immediate communication of God to each personality. It is therefore ordinary generation as the basis of natural humanity which John describes in the first three phrases.

[1] Irenæus quotes this passage thrice in the form: *Qui natus est*, etc., thus, applying the words to Christ Himself; and Tertullian believes so strongly in the authenticity of this reading, that he ascribes the opposite reading, that of our text, to a falsification of Gnostic (Valentinian) origin. But the Received reading is found in all our critical documents, without exception.

There is a gradation. The first term: *not of blood,* defines procreation from the purely physical point of view; blood is mentioned as the seat of natural life (Lev. xvii. 11). The plur. *αἱμάτων* has been explained, either by the duality of the sexes or by the plurality of ancestors; but it ought rather to be interpreted like the plur. *γάλαξι,* in the words of Plato (*Leg.* x. p. 887 D): *ἔτι ἐν γάλαξι τρεφόμενοι,* the plural referring to the multiplicity of the elements which form the blood (see Meyer). The two following expressions are not subordinate to the preceding, as St. Augustine thought, who, after having referred the latter to the two sexes, applies the former, the one to the woman, the other to the man. In this case the disjunctive negation would be required: *neither . . . nor* (*οὔτε . . . οὔτε*). *Οὐδέ, and no more,* simply adds a negation to the other. The two latter terms therefore still designate the same fact, that of natural birth, but that while introducing the one, the factor of will swayed by the sensual imagination (*the will of the flesh*), the other, that of a will more independent of nature, more personal and manlike (*the will of man*). To whatever height the present form of the transmission of life may rise, it cannot overleap the limit traced at the first creation, that of the physico-psychical life. *That which is born of the flesh,* whatever its form, *is* and remains *flesh.* The higher life, which is spiritual and eternal, is the immediate gift of God. To obtain it, there is needed that divine generation by which God communicates His own nature. The two words *ἐκ Θεοῦ, of God,* taken alone, contain the antithesis of the three preceding phrases. They express by their very conciseness the beauty of that spiritual birth which is wholly free from material elements, from natural attractions, from human will, and in which the only concurring factors are, God and His Spirit on the one hand, and the faith of man on the other. But how are we to explain the virtue of that faith which fits men for being begotten of God? Not in itself is the secret of its power to be found, for it is only a simple receptivity (*λαμβάνειν, receiving*), but in its object. The apostle had already hinted this by the words: *which believe on His name;* and now he declares it expressly.

Ver. 14. "*And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us; and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the Only-begotten*

come from the presence of the Father, full[1] *of grace and truth.*" —The coming of Christ in the flesh had already been mentioned, ver. 11, but from the viewpoint of His relations to Israel, and as the object of that people's unbelief. John here proclaims the same fact, but from the standpoint of His relation to faith, and consequently to all mankind. Hence the difference between the two verbs: *He came* (ver. 11), alluding to the prophecies which had announced him to Israel, and *He became* (ver. 14), which refers to His full entrance into human life. Thus regarded, therefore, there is no tautology in this repetition of the fact of Christ's advent. It seems to us as if we saw taking its course before our eyes the history of the development of faith in the heart of a Jew like John or the other apostles. They witness the Messianic manifestation and public ministry of Jesus (ver. 11); far from being partners in rejecting the Messiah, they receive Him, and find through faith in Him the privileges of adoption and regeneration, in which they soon see men of every nation participating (vv. 12, 13); and then it is that, returning upon themselves, and sounding the object of their faith, they discover its sublime grandeur: "If through faith in Him we have been born of God, it is because in Him the Son has been made flesh of our flesh. The Son of God has become our brother; and therefore in receiving Him we are made children of God." Thus the idea of the national Messiah was gradually transformed in their minds into that of the divine Saviour of humanity. The copula *καί, and,* has therefore a sort of emphasis here. It might almost be translated: "*It is because* the Word became flesh!" It is *the object* of faith which John finally describes in all its grandeur to explain this marvel: made children of God. We cannot persuade ourselves that his thought is better apprehended by Luthardt, when he thus explains *καί*: "*and to tell the whole truth;*" or by Lücke, when he finds in it the following gradation: "Not only did He come to His own, but He even appeared visibly." Meyer, almost at one with us: "John cannot refrain from expressing also the *how* of that appearing which had such saving effects (vv. 12, 13)."

The emphasis is not on the subject: *the Word*, though this

[1] D and some Fathers read: πλήρη (agreeing with δόξαν); and Augustine: *pleni* (according to a variation πλήρους?), to be referred to *unigeniti.*

name is emphatically repeated instead of the simple pronoun, but on the predicate: *became flesh.* This creative Word, to whom everything owes its existence, who created us men, Himself became a member of our humanity. The word *flesh* denotes that human nature whose mode of existence the Logos fully appropriated to Him. The term simply denotes the soft parts of the body, which, by means of the nerves and blood-vessels with which they are pervaded, are found to be the seat of physical sensibility. Thus it is that, by metonymy, the term can designate not only the body, but our entire human being, because the law which controls it in its natural state is precisely sensibility to pleasure and pain. "*For that he also is flesh,*" is said of man before the deluge, Gen. vi. 3. This phrase describes a race which in its determinations consults nothing else than the love of pleasure in all its forms. This desire of happiness and dread of suffering are not in themselves pernicious, and still less criminal instincts. They are, on the contrary, precious means for preserving man from innumerable injuries and losses of which otherwise he would not be conscious. Yet more, without this double natural sensibility, man would never be able to offer to God anything except "sacrifices which cost him nothing." He himself could never become "a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God" (Rom. xii. 1), and so fulfil his noblest destiny. On the other hand, we cannot forget that in the existence of those two natural sensibilities is found the possibility of temptation and sin. Such is the condition to which the eternal Word has consented to descend. The word *flesh* therefore signifies, first, that the Word left the immaterial condition of divine being to take a body, and to enclose Himself, like the creature, within the limits of time and space. But the meaning of the word *flesh* is not exhausted by the idea of body. Since Zeller's work (*theol. Jahrb.* 1842), it is customary among critics of the Tübingen School to ascribe to John a theory according to which the Logos borrowed only His body from humanity, while Himself filling toward this body the part which is filled by our *spirit.* But we have just proved that the word *flesh* may designate the entire human person (*spirit, soul,* and *body,* 1 Thess. v. 23), and we have explained the reason of it. And in the passage before us it *must* be so.

What could the expression possibly mean: "The Word became flesh," taken in the sense of "became body"? In reality, according to the view defended by Zeller, the Word simply became the *spirit* animating a body, but did not Himself *become* body. John must have said: "He *took* a body." Moreover, how could Jesus speak (John xii. 27) of His *soul*, and of His soul as *troubled?* How (xi. 33 and xiii. 21) could it be said that He "groaned *in His spirit*," that He was "troubled *in His spirit*," which would signify, according to Zeller's view, that Jesus groaned in the Logos! that He was troubled in the Logos! And when John relates, xix. 30, that Jesus gave up His spirit into the hands of His Father, that must signify that Jesus gave up the Logos into the hands of God! The evangelist could not write such absurdities. Evidently, according to him, Jesus possessed, along with a human body, a human soul and a human spirit. He was a whole man, and this is the meaning of the word: *became flesh.* The word *flesh* is not meant simply to denote the visibility or corporeity of Jesus (de Wette, Reuss, Baur), and as little the poverty and weakness of His earthly manifestation (Olshausen, Tholuck). It denotes the *completeness of His human nature,* in virtue of which He could suffer or enjoy happiness, be tempted, struggle, learn, make progress, love, pray, exactly *like us;* comp. Rom. viii. 3. The phrase ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο, *became man,* would not have expressed this idea so exactly. It would have described Jesus as a determinate human personality; but this personality might have reserved for Himself an exceptional position. This idea John wished to set aside, in order to assert the complete homogeneousness of His nature and mode of being with ours. The word "*flesh*" was the one which best suited this purpose. Moreover, Jesus called Himself *man,* ἄνθρωπος, in the full sense of the word, John viii. 40; and the name which He chose to give Himself above all others: *the Son of man* (i. 52 and elsewhere), implies this notion.

It is impossible to imagine a greater contrast than that which is contained in the two words: "the Word," and "flesh." What notion will unite them, and thus fill up the gulf between them? It is the notion which is expressed by the verb ἐγένετο, *became.* The natural meaning of this verb *become,* when

it has a substantive for its attribute, is certainly the transformation of the subject's mode of existence; comp. ii. 9: "the water *that was made* wine (*τὸ ὕδωρ οἶνον γεγενημένον*)." Baur and Reuss refuse to apply the natural sense here. The one asserts that, according to our Gospel, the Word remains in full possession of all His divine attributes, and consequently does not *become* flesh, but *clothes Himself* with flesh as with an accidental covering. The second also maintains that, with John, "the incarnation is something accessory;" that in this act "the Word loses absolutely nothing of what He possessed;" that incarnation is an "exaltation in respect of humanity, but not a humiliation in respect of him" (v. ii. p. 456). This critic, however, is constrained by evidence to make the following admission: "There is nothing except the word *became* which positively affirms that when He came He changed the form of His existence" (p. 451). We must add: this word *become*, interpreted as it is by the evangelist himself in all the passages which we have just quoted, proves that the change goes to the very root of the mode of existence.

It is a curious fact that Protestant orthodoxy, whether Lutheran or Reformed, has also refused till now to accept the meaning of this word "became" in all its strictness. It is evaded, in the former case, by means of the theory of the *communicatio idiomatum*, in virtue of which the divine subject, the Word, chose somehow at will, and at every moment, between the two modes of divine and human existence, transferring alternatively to the one the attributes of the other; in the latter case, by asserting more strictly the distinction between the two modes of being, but placing them purely and simply in juxtaposition in the same subject. Neither the one nor the other of these views, which are, besides, open to so many objections from a theological standpoint, corresponds to the real meaning of the word "to become." The proposition: "The Word became flesh," can only, as it seems to me, signify one thing, viz. that the divine subject entered into the human mode of being at the cost of renouncing His divine mode of being. The personal subject remained the same, but He exchanged the divine state for the human state; and if at a later time He recovers His divine state, it is not by abandoning the human,—He has too seriously appropriated it to

Himself,—but by exalting the latter to the height of the former. The contents of the proposition of John are not, therefore, two opposite states co-existing in the same subject, but: a single subject passing from one mode of being to another, which He will gradually transform so as to render it in the end capable of possessing all the attributes of the former. John's teaching, thus understood, is in entire harmony with Paul's. This apostle says in substance, Phil. ii. 6–8: "He who was in the form of God . . . *He emptied* (*anéanti*) *Himself*, having taken the form of a servant and become like to men;" and 2 Cor. viii. 9: "Though He was rich *He became poor*, that ye through His poverty might be made rich." These passages express, in a form completely independent of John's, the same identical conception: incarnation by deprivation (*κένωσις*). We shall see that the whole gospel history, and especially the delineation of our Lord's person as drawn by John, notwithstanding all the assertions to the contrary made by M. Reuss, is fully at one with the theme of the prologue thus understood.

Moreover, it is evident from the central proposition of the prologue, that John did not at all regard the Logos as an impersonal principle existing in the divine understanding, as Beyschlag views it, but as a living personality. "A principle," says Meyer rightly, "which is made flesh would be, as regards John, an impossible conception." Thus is confirmed the conclusion which we had already drawn from the second proposition of ver. 1.

The Word did not merely enter into human life; He remained in it, and appropriated it completely to Himself; such is the meaning of the proposition following. The word *ἐσκήνωσεν* literally signifies, *dwelt in his tent*. Some critics (Meyer, Reuss, etc.) see an allusion here to a technical term in the religious philosophy of the later Jews, the word *Shekinah* (from שכן, *to dwell in*), which denoted the visible forms whereby Jehovah sometimes manifested His presence in the finite world. The idea which must in this case be attached to *σκηνοῦν* would be the following, according to M. Reuss: "The terrestrial life of the Word was an unceasing revelation of the Deity." This idea is beautiful and rich. But does not the term *σκηνοῦν*, *to live in a tent*, especially with

the adjunct ἐν ἡμῖν, *among us*, rather contain an allusion to the tabernacle in the desert, which was, so to speak, Jehovah's tent, Himself a pilgrim among His pilgrim people? To this conformity between the sort of habitation adopted by Jehovah and that of His people in the desert, there corresponds the entire community of nature and of mode of being between the incarnate Word and men, His brethren. That flesh in which He lived was the tent, like to ours, in which He camped with us. The word σκηνοῦν consequently denotes all the relations which He sustained with his kindred,—relations varied and familiar, like those which a pilgrim maintains with the other members of his caravan. It is as if John had said: "We ate and drank at the same table, slept under the same roof, walked and travelled together; we knew Him as son, brother, friend, guest, citizen. To the end He remained faithful to the path on which He entered when He was made flesh." Perhaps we must also connect with this term the notion of a *transient* sojourn, such as that which is made in a tent; having come to the world, it was only to pass through it. This expression finally alludes to the divine majesty with which Jehovah manifested Himself in the tabernacle; so from the bosom of His terrestrial dwelling-place, the Word shot forth rays of divine glory before the eyes of His travelling companions. In this last idea is found the transition to the proposition which is to follow.—The regimen ἐν ἡμῖν, *among us*, might refer to men in general. But taken in connection with the term σκηνοῦν, *to live in a tent*, and with the following verb: *we beheld*, the pronoun has necessarily a more restricted sense. It relates to the immediate witnesses of the earthly life of Jesus, who sustained toward Him the familiar relations comprised in the notion of life in common. The expression of the general feeling of the church will not come till later, vv. 16–18.

According as the spectacle presents itself to the mind of the evangelist, and in the words *among us* takes the character of the most personal recollection, it becomes in him the object of a delightful contemplation. The phrase is broken; from being the subject the Word becomes the object, while the author's person and the persons of his companions take the place of subject: "*and we beheld His glory.*" How naturally

does this sudden change of construction betray the eye-witness! We observe an analogous but reversed change in the first verses of his first Epistle: "*That which we have heard, which we have looked upon of the Word of life,—for the life was manifested,—that which we have heard, which we have looked upon, declare we unto you.*" In the Epistle, where John speaks in his own name, he naturally starts from his personal impression; then he interrupts himself to put the object on the scene, and he returns finally to his impression. In the Gospel, on the contrary, where he writes as a historian, he starts from the fact: "*The Word was made flesh;*" then he interrupts himself to depict the unspeakable joy of those who were witnesses of it; and, as we shall see, after giving utterance to this feeling, he returns to the fact in the last words of the verse. The word *θεᾶσθαι, to contemplate,* is richer and fuller than ὁρᾶν (*to see, perceive*). The one has regard to enjoyment, the other to knowledge. Baur and Keim refer the word *contemplate* to the spiritual life of Jesus which all believers enjoy. This is a manifest violence to the thought of the writer, in whom those critics are unwilling to recognise a witness, but whom, nevertheless, they cannot make up their minds to regard as an impostor. Besides, the parallel, 1 John i. 1–3, does not leave the smallest doubt regarding the meaning of the expression *contemplate.* Undoubtedly the bodily eye does not suffice to enjoy such a spectacle; to secure this experience, the witness must possess an inner sense. But it is evident that bodily sight was the necessary means of that contemplation of which the author here speaks (see Introd. I. p. 91). The object of contemplation was the *glory* of the Word. The glory of God is the display of His perfections before the view of His creatures. The glory of the Word consists of the characteristics in which the perfection of the Word shone in His human life. John will speak of them immediately. Meantime, he characterizes this glory by declaring that it was a glory *as of the only-begotten Son.* The conjunction ὡς, *as,* here expresses a comparison, not between two similar things, but between the fact and the idea: "A glory such as might be expected in . . . ," or "such as could only belong to . . . ." —The word μονογενής, *only-begotten Son,* necessarily includes the idea of filiation, and not merely that of excellence or

preference. This appears from the relation of—γενής to πατήρ. M. Reuss himself acknowledges that the word includes not only a moral but a *metaphysical* idea. The first part of the word (μονο, *only*) contrasts this Son with the children spoken of in ver. 12. The latter become sons by adoption, and in virtue of that oneness which the only-begotten Son establishes between Himself and them by His incarnation. As to Him, He is Son in a sense in which no other being is. Some critics connect the name *only-begotten Son* with the *eternal generation* of the Logos (Meyer); others, with the fact of the *incarnation* (Hofmann). There might be added to these the thought of His *supernatural birth*. Luthardt alleges that the matter in question is only that *special communion* with God as Father, in which Jesus lived during the whole course of His earthly life. The evident relation between—γενής and πατήρ, as it appears to me, allows no other sense than the first. But it does not follow that the regimen παρὰ πατρός, *of the Father*, applies to the generation of the Son. Osterwald rightly translates: "of the only-begotten Son *come from* the Father." It would have been still more correct to say: *come from beside the Father*. The prep. παρά can have no other meaning. If John had meant by this regimen to express the generation of the Son, and not His coming to the earth, he would have used the prep. ἐκ (*out of*), or the gen. πατρός without a preposition. This grammatical sense is, besides, the only one which suits the context. The object is to explain, not what the Word is in Himself, but what His glory was here below: a glory of a unique kind, says John, and such as could be expected only in the Son *descending from the presence* of the Father. It was enough to approach Him to know *what Father* He was *from whose presence* this Man came as Son.

But how are we to reconcile the idea of such glory with the glimpse which John has just given us of the humiliation of the Logos? Are not the Tübingen and several other critics who follow them, right in accusing the evangelist of self-contradiction, when in chap. xvii. he puts into the mouth of Jesus a prayer claiming the restoration of His glory as Son, while it appears from our passage that He possessed it even when on earth? It need not be said that we cannot admit

the opinion of those who understand here by the glory of Jesus His miracles, or even the isolated fact of the transfiguration! It is something permanent in the life of our Lord which is in question. But, from the fact that our Lord possessed a glory on the earth, and even such a glory as could not be expected except in the only-begotten Son, must it be concluded that this glory was that of *His divine state* before His incarnation? Could not Jesus have stripped Himself (as His history otherwise shows He did) of omniscience, omnipotence, omnipresence, and yet possess, at least from the beginning of His public ministry (and it is of this period only that John here speaks), a *unique* character which distinguished Him from every other man, and revealed the Son in Him? This character was His *filial consciousness*, the inward certainty of His exceptional relation to the Father, the moral splendour which the certainty of such a bond spread over His whole person, the supreme assurance which He derived from it every moment; more particularly, as John goes on to say, the unspeakable *grace* and incorruptible truth which distinguished all His acts and words. He did not possess omnipotence in His own right,—that is evident from His praying; but by prayer He could obtain the *use* of omnipotence in the service of love, and that by coming in each case with His filial confidence to draw freely from His Father's treasures. Nor did He possess the other divine perfections; otherwise would He have been ignorant of anything, asked questions, struggled, believed, obeyed? And yet He enjoyed them sometimes as if He had possessed them, because His Father granted Him the use of them when and in what measure the task of the time demanded. This *filial* relation to the Father which was manifested in His sayings, the testimonies of His inner consciousness, and in His acts, the testimonies of the Father in His favour,—such was His glory here below. This position, glorious as it was, was not that of the divine state which He had given up. The *consciousness* of sonship is not the *state* of a son. But how could it fail to cast over Him who possessed it a reflection of that state? So the believer is even here below a child of God; he carries within him the inward consciousness of that relation,—the consciousness which he has of himself sometimes spreads a heavenly splendour over

his being. But, nevertheless, he is not yet invested with *glory* properly so called; he is a son, and consequently an heir, but not a possessor. Similarly Christ, while possessing in relation to the Father the feeling of loving and being loved as a son, and towards men the condescension and majesty which the consciousness of such a position gave Him, could nevertheless at the close of His career claim again the state of sonship which He had enjoyed from all eternity.

We have in our translation connected the last words: *full of grace and truth,* with the principal subject of the whole phrase—the Word. This is the only correct construction of the Nom. πλήρης, *full.* No doubt it might be taken, with Meyer, Luthardt, and so many others, as a nom. absol., connecting it either with δόξαν: "*glory full* of grace" . . . (hence the reading πλήρη in D), or rather with αὐτοῦ, *of Him:* "His glory, *His who was full* of grace" . . . (hence the reading *pleni* in Augustine). But those explanations, though grammatically possible, mistake the real import of this beautiful passage. Carried away by the charm of the reminiscence, the evangelist interrupted the objective description of the relations which the Word deigned to sustain toward those who surrounded Him; and now, in order to finish it, he resumes his delineation, left unfinished at the beginning of the verse. In the case of those who had *seen,* the words: "*He dwelt,*" suffice to revive the whole spectacle. But for those who had not seen, something more was needed; and this final apposition: "*full of grace and truth,*" is the last stroke finishing the portrait begun. We need not therefore, with Lücke, speak of a *parenthesis,* as if the preceding phrase had been an interposed reflection. There was no explanation in it, but an outburst of feeling. In the Old Testament the two essential features of God's character were *grace* and *truth* (Ex. xxxiv. 6): "*abundant in grace and truth.*" The same are the two features which characterized the human life of the Word, and revealed His filial relation to the Father. *Grace* is divine love clothed in the character of condescension, of gentleness to enemies, compassion to the wretched, pardon to the guilty; it is God consenting to *give Himself.* As it is grace which gives life, the Word became again by this feature of His earthly life, that which He was originally—the *life* of the creatures (ver. 4).

Truth is the reality of things adequately set in the light. And as the essence of things is the moral idea which presides over the existence of each of them, truth is the holy and good thought of God completely unveiled: it is God *revealed*. In virtue of this attribute, the Word thus became again the *light* of men (vv. 4, 5). By these two essential attributes of the character of Jesus, the witnesses of His life recognised Him as the only Son coming from the presence of the Father. Their thought was: this Being was God given, God revealed in a perfectly human existence.

As a man, after having made an important discovery, recalls with satisfaction the suggestions which first awaked his thought and put his understanding on the way, so the apostle transports himself from the time of full enjoyment to the decisive moment when he heard the first revelation, the fact of the incarnation,—a revelation not understood at first, but made clear afterwards.

Ver. 15. "*John bears witness of Him, and cried, saying,*[1] *This was He of whom I spake,*[2] *He that cometh after me is preferred* (Fr. preceded me) *before me; for He was before me.*" The present "*bears witness*" implies that the fact described in ver. 14 remains for ever established by this testimony. The verb *κέκραγε, has cried,* is added to show the fact that the testimony was rendered in express and striking terms; the use of the perf. implies that, though the herald has gone, the proclamation remains. The saying of John is quoted here solely because of its matter. At ver. 30 it will be replaced in its historical setting. It was uttered by John in the circle of his disciples the first time he saw Jesus again after having baptized Him. But the evangelist indicates that the forerunner even on that early occasion was only quoting himself: '*This is He of whom I said.*" Indeed, when speaking as he did (ver. 30), he repeated the solemn declaration which he had made the day before in presence of a whole deputation of the Sanhedrim; comp. vv. 26 and 27.[1] The declaration made on the first day contained, of course, only the words in the middle of our verse: "*He that cometh after me preceded me.*" Ver. 15

[1] ℵ D b omit λεγων.

[2] ℵ* B C Or. (once) read ὁ ὀπισω instead of ὁ ὀπισω. ℵ omits these words, and adds ὃς after ἐρχομενος.

of the prologue reproduces this declaration, not in the briefer form in which it was uttered the first day (ver. 26), but in the developed form in which John repeated and applied it to Jesus on the following day (ver. 30); this is proved by the two propositions which begin and close identically in vv. 15 and 30. By this introduction and conclusion John first applied to Jesus personally before his disciples the testimony which he had uttered in public the day before: "*This is He of whom I spake;*" then he gave a very brief solution of the sort of enigma contained in this paradoxical declaration, by adding the last words: "*for He was before me.*" The only difference is, that in ver. 15 the apostle substitutes *was* for the *is* of ver. 30. The reason for this slight change is simple: the present *is* was suggested to the forerunner by the presence of Jesus, the situation of ver. 30; while in ver. 15 the imperfect *was* expresses a logical relation: "When I so spake, it *was* He whom I had in view." The testimony which the apostle here reproduces contains a play of words in keeping with the character of John the Baptist and the original style of all his discourses: "He who follows me preceded me." Here there is an apparent contradiction, intended to excite attention and stimulate the mental activity of those to whom the saying was addressed. The enigmatical form must also have contributed to impress this important declaration on the memory of the hearers.

Many commentators have understood the words: *preceded me* (in the sense of *surpassed me*), as referring to the superior dignity and excellence of Jesus as compared with John (Chrysostom, Tholuck, Olshausen, de Wette, Lücke, Luthardt). But, 1. While taking away from the saying of John even the appearance of that contradiction which it should have, the explanation robs it of all its piquancy. 2. The evident correspondence between the prepositions ὀπίσω, *after*, and ἔμπροσθεν, *in front of, before*, does not allow us to refer the one to time, the other to dignity. Hofmann alone, we believe, has attempted to take them *both* in the sense of dignity, and he has also failed. The evangelist intending to prove by the testimony of the forerunner the pre-existence of Christ as the Logos, the temporal sense is the only one which is appropriate. 3. As Meyer observes, the saying of John thus understood

would not have even a logical sense; for nothing in general demands that he who goes before the other should be his superior in dignity. Rather it is the contrary which happens; the herald precedes the sovereign. The two prepositions therefore relate *to time*, and John means that the Christ who appears *after* him nevertheless existed *before* him. This is the sense adopted by Luther, Meyer, Bäumlein. The perfect γέγονεν simply signifies: *was there* (*de facto*); comp. vi. 25: πότε ὧδε γέγονας, "When *camest Thou hither?*" This verb denotes not the eternal *essence* of the Logos, but the simple *fact* of His existence anterior to the appearance of the forerunner. Did not the Christ, by His presence and activity throughout all the Old Testament time, *precede* His *forerunner?* Comp. xii. 41, 1 Cor. x. 4, and the passage of Malachi iii. 1, from which John the Baptist must himself have derived the notion, as we shall see.

When repeating this word on the day following, John added, in explanation of the enigma, the words: "*For He was before me;*" literally: "He was *my first.*" Some (Chrysostom, Beza, Calvin, Hofmann, Luthardt) refer this term to superiority of rank; but in this case John must have said *is*, and not *was*. Objection is taken to the tautology between this proposition and the foregoing one, if they are both taken as referring to time. This would be, it is said, to explain *the same* by *the same*. It is forgotten that there is a difference between the γέγονε, *was there*, which belongs to history, and the ἦν, *was*, which, as in the two first verses of the prologue, relates to essence: "If He *preceded* me on the stage of history, it is because He was in reality of a superior order to mine (as eternity is superior to time)." The ἦν shows, like that of ver. 1, that this being did not pass from nothingness to existence. The commentators who apply the word *first*, as we do, to time (Meyer, Bäumlein), say that the superlative πρῶτος, *first*, is here put for the comparative πρότερος, *anterior*, and quote in favour of this meaning xv. 18. But there is more in the word *first* than a simple comparison between two individuals placed in the same rank, of whom the one is merely anterior to the other. The expression πρῶτός μου, *my first*, combines two ideas: *the first* (absolutely speaking), and *first* in relation to me. And the same is the case also xv. 18; for Jesus is

not merely persecuted *before* His disciples, as one of them, their equal, but as their chief, the real object of that hatred which assails them along with Him. This explanatory proposition therefore contains what it required to embrace the solution of the contradiction presented by the preceding affirmation: Jesus can really have *preceded* John, because He belongs to the superior order on which every being depends that has appeared in time.

It is alleged that John the Baptist cannot have uttered a saying implying the pre-existence of the Messiah, and that it is the evangelist who puts it into his mouth (Strauss, Weisse, de Wette), or who modifies some declaration of the forerunner, so as to give it a meaning which it had not. We answer, first, that the enigmatical and paradoxical turn of this saying is not favourable to such a suspicion. In its very originality it bears the mark of its authenticity. Then, the evangelist quoting it *twice* in the following narrative, indicating at the same time the place and time when it was uttered, we must impute to him a rare degree of effrontery if we suppose that he invented it himself. But, it is asked, could the forerunner have risen to a conception of the person of Christ which the church reached only much later? However little John had seriously meditated on the oracle which contained the programme of his own ministry, Mal. iii. 1, he must have found in it the contents of the saying quoted by the evangelist. Jehovah, identifying Himself with the Messiah, said: "Behold, *I send* my messenger, and he shall prepare the way *before me*, the Messiah." Now, when the sending of the sent one includes his birth, as in this case, it is manifest that he who sends must *pre-exist* the sent. John the Baptist, then, did nothing more than render in his own piquant and playful style the contents of that oracle which must have been so familiar to him. As to the words of the forerunner: "He who cometh *after me*," are they not in reality the reproduction of the prophet's: "He shall prepare the way *before me*"? The forerunner, besides, had received his own revelations, the command, for example, to join with his preaching the extraordinary ceremony of baptism; it seems that there had been a sort of theophany: "*He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me*," i. 33. And if we allow some reality

to the baptism scene, must not the saying of the Father: "*This is my beloved Son,*" have gone to open the eyes of John conclusively to the divine character of Him whom he preceded? Moreover, Isaiah had already called the Messiah "*Mighty God, Everlasting Father,*" ix. 6;[1] and Daniel had described Him as "coming with the clouds of heaven," vii. 13. The Rabbis themselves had not been without an understanding of what such sayings contained in regard to the person of the Messiah (comp. Meyer).

"*The Greek seeks wisdom,*" says St. Paul. The Jew does not reach the understanding of divine things by the way of investigation; he receives testimony: for he lives in a sphere of revelation. Nothing therefore more natural than the quotation of the forerunner's testimony, the official witness of the Messiah, in the prologue. But what completely explains the quotation is, the part which the forerunner's declaration seems to have played in the life of the author himself. He had just been relating his own experience, v. 14; and if it be true—as it must be if the author is the Apostle John—that he personally heard this testimony from the mouth of the Baptist, and that this saying formed the starting-point of his faith, and of that of the church in general, how could he avoid encasing it, like an incomparable jewel, in this solemn preface? We do not take into account here the absurd readings of the principal Alexandrine MSS. (ℵ B C). To the testimony of the apostles, and to that of John the Baptist, there is joined, finally, that of the whole church.

Ver. 16. "*And*[2] *of His fulness have all we received, and grace for grace.*" The word *fulness* connects this verse with the epithet πλήρης, *full,* at the end of ver. 14. The fact being, that the testimony of the church is in a still more direct relation to that of the apostles than to that of the forerunner. A numerous group of authorities, mostly Byzantine, read καί, *and,* at the beginning of the verse; while the

[1] We know not how many different senses have been sought for these expressions. What would be said if orthodox writers indulged in like violence?

[2] Instead of καί, which is given by T. R., with A E F G H Γ Δ Λ Π Syr^{cur}, Syr^{sch}, Syr^{p}. It$^{aliq.}$ and the most of the Mnn., there is read ὅτι in ℵ B C D L X, It$^{aliq.}$ Cop. some Mnn. and several Fathers, in particular Or. (thrice).

Alexandrines read ὅτι, *because.* The Greco-Latin authorities are divided. Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, and modern critics in general, prejudiced as they are in favour of the Alexandrine text, uphold the second reading. Meyer gives a strange proof in its support. The reading *and* proceeded, according to him, from the erroneous idea that ver. 16 is a continuation of the Baptist's discourse. But it is precisely to the reading *because* that the suspicion of this unfortunate origin applies. For the logical particle *because,* much more than the simple *and* of ver. 16, forms the continuation of ver. 15. The connection by καί, *and,* being much looser, easily admits of our detaching this verse from ver. 15, and connecting it, as is evidently the author's intention (comp. the word *fulness* with the word *full*), with ver. 14. It certainly does not follow from this that ver. 15 is only a parenthesis. The three testimonies are simply placed in juxtaposition, and this is the force of the particle καί, *and, and further.* The origin of the Alexandrine reading *because* is easily explained. We know that the Gnostic Heracleon had regarded vv. 16 and 17 as still belonging to the Baptist's discourse. Origen, far from contesting this explanation, extends it even to ver. 18. Other Greek Fathers shared this view, at least in regard to ver. 16. Is it not clear that it was under the influence of this opinion that the *and* was transformed into *because,* perhaps with the help of the ὅτι, *because,* which begins the following verse? As to this opinion in itself, it is untenable, for the words, *all we,* ver. 16, imply the existence of the church, and because the past tenses ἐγένετο, *came,* and ἐξηγήσατο, *declared,* vv. 17 and 18, suppose the ministry of Jesus to be closed.

The *fulness* of which John speaks is the inexhaustible riches of grace and truth (ver. 14) which flowed from the Word made flesh. The following sayings develope those two ideas: ver. 16, that of grace; ver. 18, that of truth; they are both united in the transition saying, ver. 17. The term *fulness,* πλήρωμα, denotes that with which an empty space is filled. The force of this word in our context is so simple, so evidently determined by its connection with ver. 14, and the choice of the word is so naturally accounted for by the epithet πλήρης at the end of that verse, that it is difficult to understand how

several modern critics (Schwegler, Hilgenfeld) have been able to turn it into a weapon against the authenticity of our Gospel, by deriving it from the Gnostic doctrine of the Valentinian *plerôma.* It was this sect, on the contrary, which drew its nomenclature from the prologue of John, and substituted a mythological sense for the simple meaning belonging to all the terms: *grace, truth, fulness,* in our passage (see Introd. p. 218 et seq.). Comp. besides, Rom. xv. 29, where Paul uses the expression: πλήρωμα εὐλογίας, *fulness of blessing,* exactly in the same sense as John in our passage. In the word *all we,* are embraced all the individual believers mentioned in ver. 12,—that is, the whole church. It is remarkable that the verb, *we have received,* has no *regimen;* arising from the fact that the matter in question was not such or such a blessing received, but above all, the act of *receiving* itself: "We have all had the privilege of drawing from that inexhaustible source." By the subsequent appendix, *and grace for grace,* the apostle characterizes less the object than the *mode* of receiving. The καί, *and,* signifies, "And that in the *way* which I am going to describe." The terms, *grace for grace,* which are often translated: *grace upon grace,* contain a sort of play on words. In reality, the preposition ἀντί, *for, in exchange for,* strictly characterizes the legal system. Under the law, a grace is received *in exchange for* some desert. But in the new order of things, it is a grace received which becomes our title to receive a new grace. In no other way could the method of complete gratuitousness be better expressed. It was therefore of set purpose that John wrote this ἀντί, *in exchange for,* instead of ἐπί, *upon,* which would simply have designated one grace *added* to another, as in Phil. ii. 27, and ordinarily. There is a boldness in this application of the very formula of the opposite dispensation to the economy of grace, which betrays the paroxysm of exultation. He thereby invites his readers to make every grace received a motive to be urged before the Lord for obtaining a greater favour; and that without ever fearing to exhaust the fulness placed within our reach in the Word made flesh. Chrysostom and Beza understand by the grace granted in exchange for preceding grace, the New Testament substituted for the Old; but how could the latter be here called *grace,* when in the verse follow-

ing it bears the name of *law*, in opposition to grace itself? In the following verse, the experience thus described, ver. 16, is explained by the very essence of the new order of things which has appeared in Christ.

Ver. 17. "*For the law was given by Moses: grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.*" Here we again meet with the paratactic form characteristic of the Hebrew; a writer of Greek origin would certainly have indicated the contrast between the two propositions of this verse by the particles μέν and δέ. The gospel dispensation is opposed to the law as *grace* and as *truth*. The gospel, so far as it is *grace*, offers and gives; the law commands and demands. Now, as the real essence of God cannot consist in demanding, it follows that the law can only be a transitory, pedagogical phase of the revelation of God, and that the new order of things, that of grace, can alone be that of the full revelation of God, of *truth*. The subtle explanation of Bengel, *Lex iram parans* (in opposition to grace) *et umbram habens* (in opposition to truth), would be more in keeping with the context of Col. ii. 16, 17, than with that of John's prologue. The word ἐδόθη, *was given*, implies the external and positive institution of the law; the word *came* denotes grace and truth appearing historically in the very person of Him who is the essential source of those blessings (ver. 4), and then becoming realized in His life and communicated through Him. Moses may disappear, the law remains nevertheless; it is only *given* by him. But take away Jesus Christ, and grace and truth disappear; for these gifts have *come* by Him, they are closely united to His person. "John," says Bengel, "chooses his expressions with the rigour of a philosopher." Let us rather say, with that energetic precision which is the constant characteristic of the inspired style.

It is at this point of the prologue that the apostle for the first time pronounces the great name so long expected, *Jesus Christ*. In proportion as the history of the mercies of the Word toward humanity unfolds before his view, the spectacle inspires him with terms ever more concrete and more human. The *Logos* of ver. 1 appeared as *light*, ver. 5; as *Son*, ver. 14; in ver. 17, He is at length called *Jesus Christ*,—in the same way as the *God* of ver. 1 receives the name of *Father*, in relation to the only-begotten Son, ver. 14, and becomes *the*

Father absolutely, that is, the Son's Father and ours, in ver. 18. Through the incarnation and human life of Jesus, this whole celestial world draws near to us, and takes for us life and reality.

Ver. 18. "*As to God, no man hath seen Him at any time; the only-begotten Son,*[1] *which is*[2] *in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him.*" After having developed the first of the two features which constitute the divine character of the glory of Christ, ver. 16, and having conjoined them to ver. 17, to contrast them with the law, the apostle now developes the second: truth, and thus finishes the description of the πλήρωμα, the *fulness*, ver. 16*a*. Truth, in the eyes of John, as we have seen, is God perfectly revealed and known. The absence of any connecting particle between vv. 17 and 18 supposes a very intimate logical relation between the verses: this relation consists precisely in the identity of truth and the knowledge of God. In Jesus *came* truth, because He possesses and brings the adequate revelation of the Divine Being. The knowledge of God cannot be the result of a philosophical investigation. Our understanding seizes only certain isolated rays of the revelation of God, dispersed in nature and conscience; it does not succeed in uniting them into one whole, still less in ascending to the living focus from which they emanate. The natural or theocratic revelations, the visions even granted to the saints of the Old Testament, contained only an approximate manifestation of the divine being, as is admirably expressed by the word of the Lord to Moses, at the time when He promises to show him His glory: "*Thou shalt see my back parts; but my face shall not be seen*" (Ex. xxxiii. 23). For "*there shall no man,* in his state of pollution, *see God and live*" (xxxiii. 20). No one, therefore, either within or without the theocracy, obtained the privilege of acquiring that complete and living knowledge of God, of which *sight* is the emblem. The word *God,* though the object of the verb, stands at the head of the sentence. It

[1] While T. R. reads ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός, with 13 Mjj. Syr^{cur}, It^{plerique}, Or. (once) and almost all the Mnn., we find the reading ὁ μονογενὴς θεός in ℵ B C L, Syr^{sch}, Cop. Clem. Or. (twice), and other Fathers. Elsewhere, Or. reads υἱὸς θεοῦ, υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, readings which are not found in any document.

[2] ℵ omits ὁ ὤν.

is the principal idea.—The perf. ἑώρακε, *hath seen*, rather denotes the result than the act of vision: "There is no one here below who can speak of God as *having seen Him de visu*." The full truth, therefore, does not exist on the earth outside of Jesus Christ. It really *came* with Him, as has been said, ver. 17. The second part of ver. 18 states the reason of it. The reading ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός, *the only-begotten Son*, is certainly the true one; that of the Alexandrines, *God the only-begotten Son*, despite the authority of the *Vatic.*, has not been admitted by almost any modern editor, and the support of the *Sinaït.* will not procure it for the future any better welcome. It savours too much of later dogmatics. The fact that it is found in Clement of Alexandria and in Origen (twice) indicates its origin. The quality attributed to Jesus, of being the perfect revealer of the Divine Being, is founded on His intimate and perfect relation to God Himself: "*Who is in the bosom of the Father.*" Such is virtually the relation between the partic. ὁ ὤν, *who is*, and the verb ἐξηγήσατο, *hath declared*. Bäumlein rightly says: "That *who is* proves that Jesus *can* really reveal God. It is equivalent to an *inasmuch as He is* (ἅτε ὤν)." We can explain in two ways the image used here by John. Either it is borrowed from the position of two neighbour guests at a feast (xiii. 23); or, what appears more suitable to the context, it is derived from the attitude of a son seated on his father's knees and leaning on his bosom. In any case, it expresses complete openness. He who occupies this unique place understands the Father's most secret thoughts. We can see from the term κόλπος, *bosom*, that the mystery of the Son is a matter, not of metaphysics, but of love. The omission of ὁ ὤν in the *Sinaït.* is condemned unanimously by the other documents. Hofmann, Meyer, Luthardt (2d ed.), refer this present participle to the state of Jesus Christ now since His ascension; and the prep. εἰς is explained, according to Meyer, by the idea of His *return* to this state. But it is obvious that in this sense this partic. *which is*, could not justify the: "He *hath* declared," which refers to the terrestrial life of Jesus. Meyer answers, that His elevation *confirms* the truth of His teaching. This is a mere evasion; there is no natural connection between Christ's present state of glory and His ministry of teaching while He

was here below. This present partic. can therefore only refer to a state which preceded or accompanied the earthly ministry of Jesus. It may be applied (like the analogous expression of ver. 1: ἦν πρός) to the divine state of the Logos before the incarnation. A man who does not rank among commentators —Napoleon—has expressed himself thus: "Christianity says with simplicity, *No man hath seen God, except God;* that is a saying of profound meaning." This saying indicates the relation between our ὁ ὤν, *which is,* and the verb ἐξηγήσατο, *hath declared,* better than many theologians have been able to grasp it. Yet the eternal relation of the Son to the Father could not directly influence His religious teaching here below; for He spoke on the earth as a man. If He had spoken of God as God, His language would have been incomprehensible. Then all that the Son has revealed of God on the earth must have passed through His human consciousness. But this human consciousness, especially after the fact of His baptism, was that *of the Son;* and thereby He possessed, as no other, the necessary organ for knowing God as His Father. Finally, if account is taken of the fact that His earthly teaching was completed by the Holy Ghost whom He sent after His ascension, we recover in this way the truth contained in the explanations of Meyer and Hofmann; and we thus reach the full interpretation, that of Lücke, which applies the pres. partic. ὁ ὤν, *which is,* to the *permanent* and indestructible relation between the Son and the Father. This relation may have passed through very different phases; but it has never been completely interrupted for a moment (iii. 13). The use of the preposition of motion, εἰς, *towards,* with the verb of rest, ὤν, *which is,* arises from the fact that the regimen, "*the bosom of the Father,*" denotes in reality, not a place, but a life. The Son *is* there only because He plunges into it by His unceasing action; it is so with every state which consists in a moral relation. It was the meaning of the phrase already referred to, ἦν πρός (ver. 1). The substitution of εἰς for πρός, in our verse, arises from the difference between a strictly local regimen (κόλπος) and a personal regimen (θεός). The pron. ἐκεῖνος is here, as usually in John, exclusive, "He, and He alone." To explain the use of the word ἐξηγεῖσθαι, it does not seem to us natural, whatever Meyer may say, to have

recourse to the technical application of the word among the Greeks, who used it to denote the explanation of divine things by the ἐξηγηταί, the men officially charged with this function. The simplicity of John's style excludes this association, which is not necessary to explain the expression. The understood object of ἐξηγήσατο, *hath declared*, is undoubtedly the first word of the verse, Θεόν, *God*, the influence of which makes itself felt to the end. But John did not express it with the view of calling attention, as at ver. 16, to the verbal notion rather than to the object of the action: "He, even *He hath declared!* truly declared!" His teaching about God alone deserves the name of interpretation. Meyer prefers to supply as the object: the contents of what He has seen in God.

We see from the word πατρός, *of the Father*, that the truth brought into the world by the Son does not consist of a collection of new metaphysical ideas about God, but rather of the revelation of His Father-character. To make this revelation, it was sufficient for Jesus to reveal Himself as the Son; for to prove Himself Son, is to teach the world what it never would have suspected: that God is essentially a Father. And if He is Father in His inmost essence, and in virtue of an eternal relation, how could His relations to His creatures fail to have also a paternal character? Such is the new explanation which the Son has given of the Divine Being, and which He alone as the Son could give. It is the initiation of the earth into the deepest secret of heaven: God is from all eternity *Father*,—that is to say, *love*. Outside of this divine interpretation contained in the life and sayings of Jesus, every idea which man forms of God is imperfect or imaginary, an idea, and, up to a certain point, an *idol*, according to John's own expression (1 John v. 21).

All, therefore, that man would have found on the pathway of obedience in communion with the Logos his Creator, he recovers by the way of faith in the person of Jesus Christ. The word diffused life: Jesus brings it to us again in the form of grace. From life there sprang up light: Jesus gives it back to us under the name of truth. God-given, God-manifested: such are the blessings which prove the real presence in Jesus Christ of the Divine Logos revealed in the first verses of the prologue. The church, by receiving from

Him those incomparable gifts, can herself attest as well as those first witnesses the identity of the Person of the Logos with that of Jesus Christ, and, joining her testimony to the choir of the apostles and to that of the prophets, the one represented by the evangelist, the other by the forerunner (vv. 14, 15), can bear witness, on the foundation of a living experience, to the fact, without which both life and light for man disappear: the incarnation of the word, the union consummated in Christ between God and man.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS ON THE PROLOGUE.

I. The Plan of the Prologue.

Three thoughts appear to us to sum up this so remarkable piece, and to mark its progress: the *Logos*, the Logos *misunderstood*, the Logos recognised and *received;* in other words, the Logos (vv. 1–4), unbelief (vv. 5–11), and faith (vv. 12–18). Between the first and second part ver. 5 forms the transition, as between the second and third vv. 12 and 13. The relation between the last and the first is indicated externally by the similarity of the expressions in vv. 18 and 1; it may be formulated thus: He whom the church knows and possesses as her Redeemer, is no other than the eternal Logos, the life and light-giving principle of the universe, the creator of all things. By faith in this Incarnate Word the church is restored to her normal relation, to this principle of life for the universe and of light for man.

This plan seems to us preferable to that which Luthardt maintains in his second edition: three parts or cycles, each containing, although from a somewhat different point of view, a summary of the whole Gospel history: vv. 1–5, 6–13, 14–18.

There is something on the face of it improbable in this thrice repeated summary of one and the same history. Besides, Luthardt is obliged himself to acknowledge that in the first cycle faith is not a subject in question,—which

is, however, one of the essential factors of the Gospel history, —and that, in the third, unbelief is as little a subject in question, though one of the most decisive elements of this history. Finally, is it not contrary to all exegetical probability to give to the δέ, *but*, of ver. 12, the only adversative particle of the prologue, an altogether secondary sense, instead of regarding it as indicating the great contrast between unbelief and faith?—and then to draw the line of demarcation between the second and third part at ver. 14, which runs so strictly between vv. 12 and 13?

Very far, then, from admitting three cycles, each presenting *the whole* of the history, we hold to three cycles, each presenting *one* of the three factors of the history. The entire narrative will rest precisely on the relation of those three factors, and the prologue thus appears introducing, as it were, on the scene the personages of the drama which is to follow, presented in their highest signification.

II. Intention of the Prologue.

What is the object of this introduction? Has it regard to speculation or faith?

We here meet with three opinions: the first ascribes to the author a purely speculative aim; the second supports a strictly practical intention, but one complicated with metaphysical prepossessions; finally, according to the third, the author, while ascending to the highest principles of Christian knowledge, proposes no other aim than that which he himself professes (xx. 31): "*That ye might believe*," and which demanded, above all, that the object of faith should be revealed in all its grandeur.

1. The Tübingen School is the most thoroughgoing exponent of the first view. According to it, the author unfolds in the prologue the idea which is the *metaphysical basis* of the following narrative, or rather, which is its real source. The speculative idea of a mediator between the infinite God and the finite world was found by the author in the sphere in which he lived, expounded in the prologue, and illustrated by means of the almost wholly fictitious narrative which follows.[1]

[1] Comp. pp. 96, 97; 98, 99; 106 et seq.; 173-180; 261, 262.

If the results to which exegesis has brought us are well founded, this mode of regarding the prologue is untenable. We have seen in reality that the notion of the Logos does not prepossess the author for itself, but solely in relation to the historical appearing of Jesus. The thesis, "*The Word was made flesh*," is not set down for the sake of this one, "*In the beginning was the Word;*" it is this, on the contrary, which is subservient to the former. John does not come to invite his readers to a metaphysical walk amid the depths of the divine essence, in order to discover a being called the Logos; he simply wishes to lead them to put such confidence in the historical Christ, that they may through Him have access to the riches of God Himself. It is not the person of Jesus which is at the service of the thesis of the Logos; if Jesus receives this title, it is that men may attach themselves to Him as the perfect Mediator.

Nothing is more fitted to indicate the opposition between the speculative intention ascribed to the prologue by Baur and the real aim of this whole passage, than the explanation which this critic gives of ver. 14. The proposition, "*The Word was made flesh*," in which we have found the central word of the prologue, holds, according to Baur, a wholly subordinate place; it expresses merely the historically insignificant phenomenon of the *visibility* of the Word; salvation is not attached to this fact; the latter only serves to make its sweetness a little more *felt*. This explanation demonstrates, better than all proofs, the contradiction which exists between the idealism of the Tübingen theologian and the serious realism of the evangelist.

2. M. Reuss has avoided such an exaggeration. He acknowledges that the essential tendency of the prologue is pre-eminently practical; that John wishes to guide his readers to faith. But while unfolding with this intention the object of faith, he adds thereto a speculative thesis. "It was not his concern at all to make one metaphysical theory prevail over another; speculation with the apostle was not an end, but a means." He only sought to explain to himself philosophically the contents of his faith, and the notion of the Logos was only the means with which contemporaneous philosophy furnished him for gaining his end. The invitation to faith

became thereby transformed under his pen into an initiation of his readers into Christian Gnosis. This is also the result reached by Lücke's study.

This view, while saving, on the one hand, the practical and apostolical character of the prologue, accounts, on the other, for the use of the term Logos, which seems to belong to the language of philosophy.

It would follow from this view that John blended in one unique whole the elements drawn from the teaching of Jesus and those which he borrowed from the metaphysics of Philo. But we must then reject the authenticity of the Gospel, which M. Reuss does not do. Is it conceivable that an apostle could have offered to the faith of the church a Christ resulting from such an amalgam? If John proposed to fix in writing the theory of the Logos which had rendered to him personally the high service of interpreting his faith to him, could he not at least content himself with doing so in the epistolary form which he knew and used? Was it allowable for him to work out with this view the composition of a gospel?

M. Reuss seems to regard this procedure as unconscious and innocent. Unconscious? But it has long been matter of remark that John avoids putting the term Logos in the mouth of Jesus. He was therefore conscious of the difference between what he held from His teaching and what proceeded from another source. Innocent? On this point history has pronounced, and its sentence is severe. History says in substance, that of all the writings of the New Testament, the Gospel of John above all, and of all the parts of this Gospel, the prologue above all, have paved the way for *Jesuolatry*, and thereby for eighteen centuries kept Christianity in the condition of a mitigated paganism. Julian the apostate knew this when he said, "It was John who declared that the Word was made flesh, . . . and he ought to be regarded *as the source of all the mischief*."[1] Such is the result of those innocent speculative vagaries of John! He is the apostle who with his own hand threw into the dough of the Gospel the leaven of idolatry, and this leaven immediately raised the dough,

[1] Cyril, *Cont. Julian.*, quoted from A. Nicolas, *Etudes philos. sur le christianisme*, t. iv. p. 117.

falsified the doctrine, vitiated the worship in spirit and in truth, and changed the Christian life at its springs. Not till the present day has the world begun to awake from this infatuation, and to recognise the true culprit pointed out by Julian! Thus it is that the promise of the Master has been verified, "*He that heareth you heareth me!*"

In short, the explanation of M. Reuss severs the theory of the Logos, as an accidental excrescence, from John's religious faith. But it is easy, on the contrary, to assure ourselves that this alleged speculation forms the basis of the apostle's faith in its most essential and vital elements. FOR JOHN, JESUS IS THE LOGOS, OR HE IS NOTHING. If the unbelief of the Jews is in his eyes a thing so monstrous, it is because in rejecting Jesus they have rejected the Logos. If faith saves and regenerates us, it is because it puts us in communion through Jesus with the Logos made flesh. Now, how could the metaphysical formula have so swallowed up in the heart of John the living object of his faith, Jesus personally known and loved, that the latter was nothing in his eyes without the former! He, the witness of that Life, the table companion, the intimate of that Master, *he* could have gone so far in his speculative mania as to place the vivifying force of the Gospel no more in that person Himself, but in the philosophical conception which he had formed of Him! This supposition is a moral impossibility.

The prologue, therefore, rightly understood, does not in the least justify such a view: it is a preface intended to initiate the reader in the true essence of the fact which is about to be related; it reveals its august character, solitary grandeur, and vital importance. The prologue is like that technical term which the composer places at the head of a musical piece, to indicate to the performer the accent and time which it requires. To raise the mind of the reader to the height of the drama which is about to unfold before his view; to make him feel that here is not a history which he may confound with others, and set aside, after having read it, to pass to another; that it contains the secret of the life of humanity, and so of his own; that the doctrines are nothing less than rays from the absolute Word; that, accepted, they will become his salvation; rejected, his death; that unbelief in regard to

Jesus is God cast off; faith, God received and possessed: such is the real intention of the prologue. This piece is the commentary on the name *Gospel;* it proclaims the highest message of God to earth. It transports the reader at the first line into the divine sphere to which this history belongs.

Thus John, in writing this introduction, has not gone beyond his part as an apostle, and his book is really from the first word to the last an appeal to faith, nothing more and nothing less. Our conviction of this truth will be thoroughly established as we account for the origin of the notion and the term Logos, and as we prove that the borrowings from contemporaneous metaphysics, which are ascribed to the apostle, are in reality only loans which are made to him.

III. The Idea and Term Logos.

The three questions which we have to resolve are these: Whence did the evangelist derive the *notion* of the Logos? What is the origin of this extraordinary *term?* What is the reason of its *use?*

First of all we establish a fact, viz. that the prologue does not contain a *thought* which goes beyond Christ's own testimony in the fourth Gospel, and the teachings of the Old Testament explained by this light. B. Weiss[1] mentions two principal points in which the prologue seems to him to go beyond the testimony of Christ: 1. The notion of the Word, by which John expresses the pre-historic existence of Christ; 2. The creating function which is attributed to that Being. But do not the entire contents of the first propositions of the prologue flow from the following sayings put by John into the mouth of Jesus: "*What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where He was before?*" vi. 62; "*Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am,*" viii. 58; "*And now, O Father, glorify Thou me with Thine own self, with the glory which I had with Thee before the creation of the world,*" xvii. 5; "*For Thou lovedst me before the creation of the world,*" xvii. 24.

Meantime let us leave aside the *term* Logos, to which we shall return. If Christ existed personally before the creation, as He affirms in those sayings, could He exist otherwise than

[1] *Johanneischer Lehrbegriff*, 1862.

with God and in God, as the prologue says? And as to His creating function, was it not enough to connect the thought of the eternal existence of the Logos in God with the saying, "*Thou lovedst me before the creation of the world*," to be aware that He who speaks thus cannot have remained a stranger to the work which brought the world out of nothing. This is the necessary inference from v. 17, "*As the Father worketh hitherto, I work also*," comp. v. 19 and 26.

The other assertions of the prologue are deduced with the same ease from the discourses and acts of Jesus in the Gospel: ver. 4 ("*In Him was life*" . . .) from v. 26: "*As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself;*" ver. 9 ("*That was the true light*") from viii. 12 and ix. 5: "*I am the light of the world . . . He that followeth me shall have the light of life;*" ver. 7 ("*John came for a witness*") from i. 34: "*And I saw, and bare record, that this is the Son of God*," and from v. 33: "*Ye sent unto John, and he bare witness unto the truth.*" The prologue expresses the idea of the presence and activity of the Logos in the world generally, and in the theocracy in particular (*His house, and His own*), previously to His incarnation, vv. 10 and 11. This idea flows directly from what Jesus teaches in chap. x. as to how the voice of the Shepherd is *recognised* by *His sheep;* and that not only by those who are already in the Old Testament fold (ver. 3), but also by those who are not of that fold (ver. 16), the children of God scattered throughout the world (xi. 52). The contrast between carnal birth and divine generation, which plays so conspicuous a part in the prologue (ver. 13), is expressly taught by Jesus in the saying (iii. 6): "*That which is born of the flesh is flesh; that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.*" The reality of Christ's humanity, so forcibly asserted in the prologue (ver. 14), is one of the fundamental ideas of the entire narrative. In no Gospel, perhaps, so much as the fourth, does the purely human side of our Saviour's person and affections come into view. He is worn out with fatigue (iv. 6); He thirsts (iv. 7); He weeps over His friend (xi. 35); He is moved and even agitated (xi. 33, xii. 27). At the same time, His glory, *full of grace and truth*, His *Son* character, of which the prologue speaks so admirably (vv. 14–18), appears in the narrative of all the manifestations of

Jesus in act and word: in the account of His entire dependence (vi. 38 et seq.), of His absolute docility (v. 30, etc.), of His unlimited intimacy with the Father (v. 20), of the greatness of the works which He receives power to do, as to quicken and judge (v. 21, 22), of His perfect assurance of being heard, whatever He may ask (xi. 41, 42), of the adoration which He accepts (xx. 28), and which He demands even as the equal of the Father (v. 23). The testimony of John the Baptist, quoted at v. 15, is borrowed textually from the following narrative (i. 27, 30). The idea of the gift of the law as a preparation for the Gospel (ver. 17), flows from v. 46, 47. Ver. 18, which closes the prologue, reproduces almost textually the saying, vi. 46: "*Not that any man hath seen the Father, save He which is of the Father, He hath seen the Father.*" Finally, the terms *Son* and *only-begotten Son* are borrowed from vi. 40: "*This is the will of the Father, that every one which seeth the Son,*" . . . from iii. 16 (which John certainly puts into the mouth of Jesus): "*God so loved the world, that He gave His only-begotten Son,*" and from iii. 18: "*Because he hath not believed in the name of the only-begotten Son of God.*"

The sayings ascribed to Jesus in the course of the narrative thus contain all the ideas expressed in the prologue, or at least their immediate premises. We cannot even except the idea of creation by the Word. There remains only the term Logos, used by John to designate the Son in His pre-existent state. Undoubtedly it is this term, used in the philosophical language of the time, which has led to the author of the prologue being transformed from a disciple of Jesus into a disciple of Philo.

We shall not return upon the subject, which we have already considered in the Introduction (p. 174 et seq.), of the relations between the view of John and the system of Philo. We shall confine ourselves to summing up the differences which distinguish and even contrast them.

1. The word λόγος, in John, signifies, as in the biblical text, *word*. In Philo, it signifies, as it does in philosophical language, *reason*,—a fact which leads us to suspect a certain difference of origin in the use which they make of the same term.

2. The speculation of the Logos has in Philo a metaphysical bearing. God being conceived as the absolutely indeterminate and impersonal Being, it was impossible to pass from such a Being to the finite and varied world which we behold. To explain this great fact, Philo must therefore have recourse to an intermediate agent—a *second God*, the divine reason personified, the Logos. In John, the notion of the Logos has an entirely different bearing; it is not at all necessitated by the nature of God Himself. For him God is a Father (i. 18); His essence is love (iii. 16). He puts Himself into personal relation with the world; He loves it; He determines to save it, and it is He Himself who sends into it the Logos (vi. 32). Nay more, it is He who acts as intermediate agent between the world and the Son who has become man. He *draws* men to Christ; He *gives* them to Him (vi. 37, 44). He testifies in His favour, even in the world of sense, by miracles (v. 36, 37, xii. 28). What an offence to the thought of the sage of Alexandria! In a word, the existence and activity of the Logos in John are a matter of love (i. 18, xvii. 24), not at all a logical necessity.

3. The work of the Logos in Philo is confined to the creation and preservation of the world; the thought does not even occur to him of connecting it with the salvation either of Jews or of the world, any more than with the appearing of the Messiah. In John, on the contrary, if mention is made of the creating Logos, it is only on the occasion and in view of the redemption of which this Divine Being is to be the agent; the Messianic idea finds its perfect realization in His appearing. For Philo, as for Plato, the principle of evil is matter; and hence he cannot think of making the Logos appear on the earth in a bodily form. The idea of the incarnation would have filled him with horror. In John, on the contrary, the grand fact of history is this: "*the Logos was made flesh.*" This central word of the prologue expresses the act to which everything in the past leads on, and from which everything flows in the future.

If, therefore, the rational premises are different and opposite in the two authors; if the very term Logos is used by them in different meanings,—it becomes impossible to regard the one as the disciple of the other. What remains for us is to seek,

by going back beyond both, a common source which shall explain the coincidence of expression in the diversity of views. This source is not hard to find. John and Philo were both Jews. The same Old Testament had therefore regulated their religious education. Now, there were three lines in this Holy Book converging to the notion and the term of whose explanation we are in search: 1. The appearances of *the angel of the Lord* (*Maleach Jehovah*), that messenger of God who serves as His agent in the world of sense, and who is sometimes distinguished from Jehovah, and again identical with Him; comp. *e.g.* Gen. xvi. 7 with ver. 13; then Gen. xxxii. 28 with Hos. xii. 4, 5. God says of this mysterious being, Ex. xxiii. 21: "*My name* (the knowledge of my inmost essence) *is in him.*" In Mal. iii. 1 it is positively declared that the Messiah shall be no other than this Divine Person, the God adored in the temple of Jerusalem: "*Adonaï* (the Lord), *whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to His temple, even the Angel of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, He shall come.*" Zech. xii. 10 presents the same view. The Messiah, who is to be pierced by His people, is Jehovah Himself: "*They shall look upon me whom they have pierced,*" says *Jehovah.* Thus, then, according to the Old Testament, this Divine Person, after having been from the beginning the agent in all the theophanies, is to finish His office as Mediator by Himself filling the function of Messiah. 2. The description of *wisdom*, Prov. viii.: "*The Lord possessed me in the beginning of His way, before His works even then*" (ver. 22). "*When He prepared the heavens, I was there*" (ver. 27). "*I was by Him, as an artificer; I was daily joyful, rejoicing always before Him; rejoicing in the habitable part of His earth; and my delights were with the sons of men*" (vv. 30 and 31). What characterizes this passage is the participation of Wisdom in the work of creation. This aspect does not come out in the doctrine of the angel of the Lord. On the other hand, the latter is a real personality, while the delineation of Wisdom in Proverbs seems to be only a poetical personification. 3. The active part ascribed to the *Word of the Lord.* This part begins with creation, and is continued in the prophetical revelations. Certain passages tend to personify this agent. It is a physician sent from heaven to heal, Ps. cvii. 20; a

divine messenger who traverses the world, Ps. cxlvii. 15; the infallible agent of the divine decrees, Isa. lv. 11.

From the time of the Babylonish captivity, the Jewish doctors associated those three modes of manifestation and action on the part of the Divine Being in the finite world, and united them in one single conception: that of a permanent agent of Jehovah in the sensible world, whom they designated by the name of *Memra* (Word) *of Jehovah* (מימרא די יהוה,[1] Introd. I. p. 179); leaving it impossible, I believe, to decide with certainty whether the theology of those Jewish Rabbis established a relation between this Word of the Lord and the person of the Messiah.[2]

[1] This expression is used along with that of *Shekinah*, in the Targums or Chaldee paraphrases of the Old Testament. The two oldest, those of Onkelos and Jonathan, were generally regarded as dating from the middle of the first century of our era. Recent works seem to bring down the compilation of them to the third or fourth century; but their compilation only. For a multitude of particulars prove that the materials go back to apostolic times. There are proofs even of the existence of compilations going back to the time of John Hyrcanus. With the Jews all is matter of tradition. The compilation in such a case is only "the consummation of the work of centuries." Comp. Schürer, *Lehrb. d. Neutest. Zeitgesch.*, pp. 478 and 479.

[2] Perhaps in Palestine there was more disposition to fuse in one the notion of the Word and the Messianic idea than at Alexandria. There is found in the Book of Enoch (belonging to the latter part of the second century B.C.), and in one of its very parts which are almost unanimously recognised as the oldest, a strange passage, which, if the form in which we possess it is the exact reproduction of the original text, would exclude all doubt on this point. The Messiah is there represented (chap. xc. 16–38) as a white bull, which, after receiving the adoration of all the animals of the earth, transforms all those races into white bulls like itself; after which the poet adds: "And the first bull *was the Word*, and *this Word* was a powerful animal which had large black horns on its head [the emblem of divine omnipotence]." . . . Thus it is that Dillmann, in his classical work on this book, reproduces those last words. Comp. the remarkable essay of M. Wabnitz, *Rev. de Théolog.* July 1874. The Messianic application of this passage admits of no doubt (see Schürer, *Lehrbuch der Neutest. Zeitgesch.*, p. 568). As to the last words, M. Wabnitz says: "This text contains an enigma for us which will perhaps one day be resolved." We must remember, indeed, that we have the Book of Enoch only in an Ethiopic translation, evidently made from a Greek text, which in turn seems to be the version of a Hebrew or Aramaic original. Nevertheless, it seems to us that there is here a *possible* indication of the relation established in Palestine from a date B.C., between the Divine Being called *Memra* or *Word* and the person of the Messiah. There is no doubt of the Palestinian origin of the Book of Enoch. That of *Wisdom*, which was composed at Alexandria a century before Christ, speaks, indeed, of *Wisdom*, personifying it very forcibly. But I cannot discover in it (even in chap. vii.) the notion of a real personality, nor recognise in the delineation of the persecuted just man in chap. ii. the least allusion to the person of the Messiah.

The idea of a Divine Being, the organ of Jehovah's works and revelations in the sensible world, must therefore have been more or less familiar both to John and Philo. Such is the datum common to the two authors. From that point their ways diverge and go in opposite directions. John enters the school of Jesus, where the notion of the Word takes for him a historical and perfectly concrete value. He hears Jesus assert, that before Abraham *He is;* that the Father loved Him *before the creation of the world.* . . . How could he fail to apply to Him that idea of the Word, which in so many different ways strikes its roots into the soil of the Old Testament? The *term* Logos presents itself quite naturally to his mind to designate this Divine Being who has appeared in Christ,—first, because it is of biblical origin; and then because the Jewish doctors already apply it, as we have just seen, to that superhuman Mediator. How unnecessary it is to explain the use of the term by supposing a connection on John's part with the Alexandrian speculation, appears from the fact that the same term is used in the same sense in a book—the Apocalypse—which does not in the least bear the stamp of Alexandrine idealism, xix. 13: "And His name is called *the Word of God.*" Philo, instead of proceeding, like John, on the line of the development of normal revelation, is placed at Alexandria under the influence of the Greek philosophers, especially of Platonism and Stoicism, which the Jewish school of that capital strove to amalgamate with Judaism. Those foreign masters teach him to make of the Logos a being of pure reason—*the intelligible word,* in the divine mind. As he rationalizes the Jewish meaning of the word Logos, he proceeds in the same fashion with the other terms rendered familiar to him by his Jewish education,—those of *angel, archangel, high priest,* and *son.* The scriptural reminiscences of the Old Testament throughout serve him only as materials for allegorizing in the service of conceptions which he has borrowed from Greek philosophy.

Thus are explained both the resemblances and contrasts between the two writers, without the necessity of having recourse to the imitation of either by the other—the same Jewish antecedents, but developed, on the one hand, in the direction of Christian realism; on the other, in that of the

mystic rationalism of Alexandria. In the one way the idea of the Logos becomes identified with the person of the Christ; in the other, every connecting link is broken between this idea and that of the Messiah.[1]

What, then, did John mean by applying to Jesus the name of the Word? To introduce into the church an Alexandrine speculation? He had no such view. He meant to designate the historical person called Jesus Christ as God's *absolute revelation* to the earth. By using this name, under which the Rabbis collected all the theocratic revelations, he meant to connect them with their living and permanent principle. At the foundation of all *words spoken* he found the *Word* whence they proceed, and under this name he proclaimed the greatness of his Master.

But the *use* of the name had no doubt a peculiar appropriateness in the sphere in which John wrote. If he composed his Gospel in Asia Minor after a somewhat prolonged sojourn in that country (see Introd. I. p. 246 et seq.), he must to a certainty have met with this doctrine of the Logos, which was so widely prevalent at Alexandria, and of which we find a trace perhaps in Heb. iv. 13, 14. How could it miss penetrating, with the term which expressed it, into the countries of which Ephesus was the centre? The relations between those great centres of culture, Alexandria, Ephesus, Corinth, etc., were incessant. We have an example in the New Testament itself, in the person of Apollos (Acts xviii. 24 and 27). Surrounded by all those Hellenes and Hellenised Jews who speculated on the relations between the finite and the infinite, and strove to fill up the gulf between the two spheres by the speculation of the Logos, John says to them in his prologue: "Come to us; the church possesses more than the notion of the Logos,—she possesses the Logos Himself in the person of Jesus Christ. *From His fulness we have all drawn*, even the most ignorant of us. Believe with us, and you shall receive from Him, as we have done, *grace for grace*."[2]

[1] Not that Philo is an entire stranger to the expectation of the Messiah (see the already quoted treatise of M. Wabnitz, second article, October 1874, p. 153 et seq.). But with him there is no point of contact between the idea of the Logos and the Messianic person.

[2] Compare Neander, *Gesch. d. Pflanzung d. Christl. K.*, t. ii. p. 549.

Thus John has contrived to place the healthy and quickening *realism of Christianity* in opposition to the *hollow idealism* which he found amid his surroundings.

IV. The Truth and Importance of the Conception of the Person of Jesus expressed in the Prologue.

If the prologue of John does nothing more than sum up the testimony which Jesus bore to Himself, expressing it in a striking formula calculated to impress it deeply on the consciousness of the church, there can be nothing more erroneous than to contrast it with the teaching of the Synoptics and of St. Paul, and to represent it as the final result of a series of different Christological conceptions raised chronologically the one upon the other. On the contrary, John's teaching is the purest and most normal, and at the same time the most rich and elevated expression of the consciousness which Christ had of Himself (see Introd. I. pp. 3–5).

Could this consciousness be only the height of self-exaltation, as is assumed in M. Renan's work? The explanation is incompatible with the moral character of Jesus. If He indulged in self-exaggeration even to folly, how are we to understand His inward calm, His profound humility, His unalterably sound judgment, His profoundly true appreciation of all moral relations, whether between God and man, or between man and man? M. Renan's hypothesis is belied by the whole life of Jesus, and by that kingdom of truth and holiness which has gone forth from it over the world of humanity.

Or must we call in question the historical accuracy of the discourses which John has put into the mouth of Jesus? We think we have demonstrated in the *Introduction* (I. p. 134 et seq.) the full confidence which John's narrative deserves in this particular as well as in regard to facts.

There remain the objections which may be raised by the matter of John's teaching:

1. According to M. Reuss,[1] there is a contradiction between the prologue, which teaches the perfect *equality* of the Father and the Son (as it is professed by ecclesiastical orthodoxy),

[1] *Hist. de la Théol. chrét.*, t. ii. p. 440 et seq.

and the numerous sayings of Jesus in the Gospel, whence there arises the idea of the Son's *subordination* to the Father. The doctrine of equality is thus, according to him, a thesis borrowed from the schools and from Philo; that of subordination is the true thought contained in the testimonies which emanated from the mouth of Christ. The exegesis of the prologue has shown that this contradiction has no existence, inasmuch as subordination is the thought of the preface as much as that of the discourses contained in the Gospel. Take for example the expressions: "*being with God*," ver. 1; "only-begotten *Son*," ver. 14; "*being in the bosom of the Father*," ver. 18; these expressions imply subordination as thoroughly as any saying of the Gospel. The mistake of M. Reuss is his confounding the forms of the Nicene Creed with the theology of the prologue.

2. Baur[1] does not believe in the possibility of reconciling the notion of the incarnation with that of the miraculous birth taught in the Synoptics. In the view of the latter, the person who is the subject of the Gospel history does not begin to exist till the birth of Jesus; from the incarnation point of view, on the contrary, this subject exists previously to His appearance in the flesh, and could not become afterwards anything which He is not already. But if we take in earnest the expression: *was made flesh*,—which Baur does not do,—the alleged contradiction falls of itself. The subject of the Gospel history is not the Logos continuing in His divine state, but a true man; and the fact of a real birth, miraculous or natural, becomes in such a being not only a possible, but a necessary element.

3. The most serious objection arises from the impossibility of reconciling the pre-existence of Christ with His real humanity. Thus Lücke,[2] while fully recognising the danger which lies in rejecting the pre-existence, nevertheless thinks himself obliged to deny the fact, because there would result from it a difference of *essence* between the Saviour and His brethren, which would not allow us to conceive either His character as Son of man or His redemptive office. This is likewise the view of Weizsäcker.[3] Undoubtedly the com-

[1] *Theol. Jahrb.* 1844, t. iii. p. 24 et seq. [2] T. i. p. 378.
[3] *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.*, vol. vii. 4th part, pp. 639 and 655-664.

munion of the Son with the Father is not merely moral; He does not acquire His dignity of Sonship by His fidelity; it is, on the contrary, presupposed by everything He does and says; His fidelity maintains, but does not produce, this original relation; it is the unacquired condition of the consciousness which He has of Himself. But, on the other hand, it must be owned that as to the superior knowledge which Christ possessed, it could not be the continuation of a previous knowledge brought by Him from above; otherwise, it would not have that progressive character limited to the task of the moment which we recognise in it, and which stamps it as a truly human knowledge. And as to the moral task of Jesus, it would no longer, on such a condition, have anything human in it; for where would be the moral struggle in the case of the Son if He still possessed that complete knowledge of the divine plan which He had eternally in the Father's presence? After having striven to eliminate from the discourses of Jesus the idea of pre-existence, Weizsäcker nevertheless concludes that there are in the fourth Gospel two Christs placed in juxtaposition—the one truly man, as taught by Jesus Himself and the Synoptics—the other divine and pre-existent, that of John. In attempting to solve this difficulty, we do not conceal from ourselves that we come on the most arduous problem of theology. What we shall seek in the lines which follow is not the reconciliation of Scripture with any orthodoxy whatever, but the harmony of Scripture with itself.

Does Scripture, while clearly teaching the eternal existence of the Word, teach at the same time the presence of the divine state and attributes in Jesus during the course of His life on earth? We have seen that the formula of John i. 14 is incompatible with such an idea. The expression, "*The Word was made flesh*," speaks certainly of a divine subject, but as reduced to the state of man, which, as we have seen, does not at all suppose the two states, the divine and human, as co-existing in it. Such a notion is set aside by exegesis as well as by logic. The *impoverishment* of Christ, of which Paul speaks 2 Cor. viii. 9, His voluntary *self-abasement*, described Phil. ii. 6, 7, equally imply His renunciation of the divine state at the moment when He entered upon human existence. The facts of the gospel history are at one with those apostolic

declarations, as we have shown in the Introduction (I. p. 106 et seq.). Jesus no longer possesses on the earth the attributes which constitute the divine state. Omniscience He has not, for He asks questions, and Himself declares His ignorance on one point (Mark xiii. 32). He possesses a pre-eminent prophetic vision (John iv. 17, 18), but this vision is not omniscience. No more does He possess omnipotence, for He prays, and is heard; as to His miracles, it is the Father who works them in His favour (xi. 42, v. 36). He is equally destitute of omnipresence. His love even, perfect as it is, is not divine love. This is immutable. But who will assert that Jesus in His cradle loved as He did at the age of twelve, or at the age of twelve as He did on the cross? Perfect relatively, at every given moment, His love grew from day to day, both in regard to the intensity of His voluntary self-sacrifice, and as to the extent of the circle which it embraced. It was thus a truly human love. "The grace which is by one *man*, Jesus Christ," says St. Paul for this reason (Rom. v. 15). His holiness is also a human holiness, for it is realized every moment only at the cost of struggle, through the renunciation of legitimate enjoyment and victory over the natural fear of pain (xii. 25, 27, xvii. 19*a*). It is so human that it is to pass over into us and become ours (xvii. 19*b*). All those texts clearly prove that Jesus, while on the earth, did not possess the attributes which constitute the divine state, and hence He can terminate His earthly career by claiming back again the glory which He had before His incarnation (xvii. 5).

How is such a self-deprivation on the part of a Divine Being conceivable? It was necessary, first of all, that He should consent to lose for a time His self-consciousness *as a divine subject*. The memory of a divine life anterior to His earthly existence would have been incompatible with the state of a true child and a really human development. And in fact the Gospel texts nowhere ascribe to Jesus a self-consciousness *as Logos* before the time of His baptism. The word which He uttered at the age of twelve (Luke ii. 49) simply expresses the feeling of an intimate relation to God and of a filial consecration to His service. With a moral fidelity like His, and in the permanent enjoyment of a com-

munion with God which sin did not alter, the child could call God His Father in a purely religious sense, and apart from any consciousness of a divine pre-existence. The feeling of His redemptive mission must have been developed in His earliest years, especially through His experience of the continual contrast between His moral purity and the sin which He saw staining all those who surrounded Him, even the best, such as Mary and Joseph. The only healthy one in this caravan of sick with whom He was travelling, He must early have discovered His task as healer of humanity, and have inwardly consecrated Himself thereto without any reserve. Besides, there is not a saying, not a deed in the gospel history, which ascribes to the infant Jesus the consciousness of His divine nature and of His previous existence. It is to the apocryphal gospels that we must go to seek this contra-natural and anti-human Jesus. According to the biblical account, the Logos, in becoming incarnate, did therefore really put off His consciousness of His divine being, and of the state corresponding to it. This self-deprivation was the negative condition of the incarnation. Here are the positive conditions of the fact; it is enough to compare them with the well-known features of the Gospel history to judge whether they have been really fulfilled.

1. Man was created *in the image of God*, as an intelligent, free, and responsible being. Such, therefore, was the limit of the abasement to which the divine subject stooped; for He must descend to the level of man, not beneath him. He lowered Himself to the state of a human personality, destined to work out His development under the conditions determined by man's destination to the divine likeness.

2. The fundamental feature of God's image in man being aspiration Godwards, and receptivity for the divine, this characteristic must be predominant in the human development of this radically divine personality.

3. The limits of our individuality impress a *relative* character on the receptivity for the divine belonging to each of us. But, in consequence of His miraculous birth, the Logos, while entering into humanity, reproduces not the type of a determinate hereditary individuality, but that of the race itself in its essence and generality. His receptivity for the

divine, His religious and moral capacity, is thus not merely that of any individual man—it is that of the whole species which became concentrated in His person, as it had once been in the person of the father of the race. He will thus be able to receive from above not only what each individual, but what the whole of humanity, is fitted to receive and possess from God. And if this collective receptivity is absolute and infinite,—in a word, like its object,—the man who concentrates it in His person will infallibly attain to the power of saying, "*He that hath seen me hath seen the Father*," and to possess in Himself "*all the fulness of the Godhead*" (xiv. 9; Col. ii. 9).

4. Finally, if humanity is eternally destined to share the divine state,—in other words, if the *true man*, in the divine idea, is the *God-man*,—the highest aspiration of the Logos in His human life must have been first to realize in Himself this participation of humanity in the divine state,—this is the meaning of *recovering His glory*,—and then to make all His brethren sharers of it by reproducing in them His glorified humanity. Such is the realization of the *gift* of us which the Father has made over to Him (xvii. 2), the accomplishment of our eternal predestination (Rom. viii. 29). On such conditions the entrance of a divine subject into the human state, and His development, do not appear to us to contain anything contradictory.

Let us then attempt to mark out the phases of the terrestrial development of Jesus Christ from this point of view, as well as the mode of His gradual restoration to the divine state.

By the birth of such a being as a member of the race, as *son of man*, humanity becomes restored to its normal point of departure; it is fitted again to enter upon a development which has not been falsified by sin. Up to the age of thirty Jesus fulfils this task. By His perfect obedience and constant sacrifice of self He raises humanity in His person from innocence to holiness. He does not yet know Himself; perhaps in the light of Scripture He begins dimly to forecast what He is in relation to God. But the distinct consciousness of His dignity as Logos would not be compatible with the reality of His human development and the accomplishment of the task assigned to this first period of His life. This task once

fulfilled, the conditions of His existence change. A new work opens up to Him, and the consciousness of His dignity as the well-beloved Son, far from being incompatible with the work which He has still to carry out, becomes its indispensable basis.

To testify of God *as the Father*, He must necessarily know Himself *as the Son*. The baptism is the decisive event which begins this new phase.[1] Anticipating the aspirations and presentiments of the heart of Jesus, the Father says to Him: "*Thou art my Son.*" Jesus knows Himself from that moment to be the absolute object of the divine love. Henceforward He will be able to say what He could not say before: "*Before Abraham was, I am.*" This consciousness of His dignity as Son, the revelation of His eternal essence, the reward of His previous fidelity, the background of all His subsequent manifestations (see the words of Weizsäcker above, p. 395), is His possession; it accompanies Him everywhere from that hour. At the same time *the heavens are opened* to Him; His eye pierces into the luminous abyss of the divine plans. He there beholds at every moment all that is necessary for the accomplishment of His Messianic task (v. 19, 20). He can *speak* now, for He can say: "*We testify that we have seen.*" Finally, humanity becomes elevated in Him to *spiritual* life, the advent of which on the earth demanded an organ like Him: *the Holy Spirit descends upon Him;* with the propagation of this higher life before Him, Christ feels Himself from this moment Master of all things, and starts on His career as the Messiah and Saviour of the world.

Yet His baptism, while restoring to Jesus His *consciousness* of sonship, did not restore to Him His filial *state*, the divine *form of God* belonging to Him. There is an immense disproportion between what He *knows* Himself to be and what He *is* really. Therein there will be for Him the possibility of temptation; therein the work of patience. Master of all, He possesses nothing. No doubt He lays out on His work

[1] Since the time the Gnostics falsified the meaning of the baptism by making it the epoch of the descent of the divine Eon upon the man Jesus, M. de Rougemont is the first who has ventured to give the fact its full importance in the personal development of our Lord. See *Christ et ses témoins*, 7e, 8e, and 9e lettres, t. i. pp. 229–296, particularly pp. 250–255.

treasures of wisdom and power which are in God, but solely because His believing and filial heart is constantly appealing to the fatherly heart of God.

It was by His ascension that His return to the divine *state* was accomplished, and that His position was at last raised to the level of the self-*consciousness* which He had from His baptism. From that time He was clothed with all the attributes of the divine state which He possessed before His incarnation; but He was clothed with them *as the Son of man. All the fulness of the Godhead* henceforth dwells in Him, but humanly, and even as Paul says, BODILY (Col. ii. 9). Ten days after His personal assumption into the divine glory, He begins to impart it to His church by the communication of the Spirit, who renders her capable of being one day made a partner in the divine state which He enjoys Himself. The Parousia will consummate the work thus begun. The first word of history: "Ye shall be as gods," will thus be the last. Living images of the Logos from our creation, we shall realize at the close of our development that type of divine human existence which we at present behold in Him. Placing ourselves toward Him in the same state of receptivity in which He constantly stood toward the Father (vi. 57), we shall see His highest wish fulfilled in us: "*Father, I will that they also be with me where I am*" (xvii. 24). Thus the divine plan is presented as it has been realized in Jesus.

The true formula, then, of the incarnation, as it is embodied in the Gospel of John, is the following:—THE LOGOS REALIZED IN JESUS, IN THE FORM OF A HUMAN EXISTENCE SUBJECT TO THE LAW OF TIME AND PROGRESS, THAT RELATION TO GOD OF PERFECT DEPENDENCE AND FILIAL COMMUNION WHICH HE REALIZED BEFORE HIS INCARNATION IN THE PERMANENT FORM OF DIVINE LIFE.[1]

Let us cast a glance at the relation of the Logos to God Himself, before the incarnation.

[1] We should not like to hold M. Gess as at one with all the ideas which we here express. We know that on several points we are not wholly agreed. But, nevertheless, the point of view which we take up is in general that which he has developed in his beautiful work: *Lehre von der Person Christi*, 1856, which I had the honour to review at the time of its appearance, *Revue chrétienne*, 1857 and 1858. The first volume of the second edition is already published. Let us hope that the completion of the work will not be long delayed.

What was the form of existence belonging to the Logos in God?

The school of Baur in our day establishes a contrast between John's conception and that of Paul on this point. Paul, they say, sets forth a Christ pre-existing as a *celestial man*, but not as a divine being; while John's conception expressly transcends this view. We have already seen that, in 2 Cor. viii. 9 and Phil. ii. 6, Paul expresses a conception of the pre-existence of Christ exactly similar to John's. Holsten himself now acknowledges this as far as the Epistle to the Philippians is concerned. He can therefore maintain a contradiction between the two apostles only by denying this Epistle to be Paul's.[1] And on what passage do Baur and his school found this alleged difference? On 1 Cor. xv. 47: "*The second man is from heaven;*" as if this passage, like the entire chapter, had not an *eschatological* signification! St. Paul is speaking not of the pre-existing Christ, but of Jesus now glorified, and as He will return from heaven to make His own like Him, as appears clearly from the words following in v. 48 and 49: "As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." We shall not bear the image of the pre-existing Christ, but certainly that of the glorified Christ. Paul's teaching on the pre-existence (comp. especially 1 Cor. x. 4 and viii. 6) is therefore, in an original form, and with expressions independent of those of John, identical in substance with the teaching of the latter.

When Paul calls the pre-existing Christ the *image of the invisible God*, he says the same as John when he designates Him by the name of the *Word*. These two expressions contain, above all, the idea of an operation *ad intra*, accomplished in the depths of the divine essence: God affirming, with an eternal affirmation, all that He thinks, wills, and loves, in a being who is the word of His thought, the reflection of His being, the object of His love, His Word, His image, His Son.

And this Word is not a simple *verbum volans:* He is a living being, a person who—if we could apply to God an

[1] *Jahrb. für prot. Theol.* 1876, first part (second article on the Epistle to the Philippians).

expression which is only appropriate to man—should be called *His realized ideal.* Let us imagine an artist giving life to the masterpiece in which he has embodied all the fulness of his genius, and having power to enter into personal relation with it: such is the relation between God and the Word. This Word can only be *divine;* for the highest affirmation of God cannot be less than God Himself. He must be *eternal;* for an affirmation which belongs to the being of God cannot have had a beginning. This Word being God's absolute *enunciation,* His only saying, His primordial and sole utterance, in which are contained all His particular utterances, every subsequent word which will re-echo in time is primarily contained in Him, and will only be realized through Him; He is the *creative* word: "In Him all things consist (*ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκε τὰ πάντα*)," says St. Paul also, Col. i. 17. In pronouncing the word, or, what comes to the same thing, in begetting the Son, God has expressed His whole being; and it is this Word who, in His turn, will call all beings out of nothingness. They will all be His free affirmation, as He Himself is that of God. By means of the universe, the Word displays in time the whole wealth of the divine treasures which God has eternally put within Him. Creation is the poem of the Word to the glory of the Father.

This notion of the Word as a creative principle has thus, as is admirably developed by Lange,[1] the greatest importance in its bearing on the conception of the universe. The universe is thus made to rest on a basis of absolute light which secures its final perfection. Blind and eternal matter, as well as fatal necessity, are banished from a creation which is the product of the Word. The ideal essence of all things is for ever saved by this view.[2]

[1] *Life of Christ,* vol. v. pp. 163–172; also vol. vi. pp. 266–268.

[2] We do not think it necessary to treat here the questions which are raised as to the internal relations of the divine persons, by the view which we have been explaining regarding the dogma of the incarnation. For the very reason that we hold the divine existence of the Son to be a matter of love (*the bosom of the Father*) and not of necessity, as with Philo, we think that, when the Word descends into the world, there to become Himself one of the beings of the universe, the Father can enter into direct relation to the world, and Himself exercise the functions of Creator and Preserver, which He commonly exercises through the mediation of the Word. Undoubtedly the Word has life in Himself, and communicates it to the world, but because the Father *hath given Him*

From this notion of the person of Christ, there follows the supreme importance of His appearance on the earth.

If He is the Word made flesh, He is the absolute revelation and communication of God to humanity, eternity come down into time, all the treasures of God brought within the reach of faith. After this gift of the Father, there is nothing *better* to wait for. There remains for humanity only one alternative: to accept Him and live, or reject Him and perish.

But if this supreme dignity of Jesus is denied, His manifestation has only a relative value; Christianity, as has been said, is no more than one of the stages of humanity.[1] However admirable Jesus Christ may be, humanity may and ought always "*to wait for another.*" For the path of progress is indefinite. The door remains open to an after-comer, and the church has nothing for it but to wait for the accomplishment of that terrible prophecy uttered by Jesus: "I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not; if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive!" (v. 43).

The question is therefore a vital one for the church and the world; and it is easy to understand why John has placed this prologue at the head of his narrative. Faith is not faith, that is to say, absolute or without after-thought, unless it has for its object that beyond which it is impossible to go.

Before leaving the prologue, we must again call the attention of our readers to the numerous and palpable errors of the oldest manuscripts, the Sinaïticus and the Vaticanus, especially the former, in this piece. The reader may refer to ver. 4 (*τῶν ἀνθρώπων*), ver. 5 (*ἐστί*), ver. 15 (*ὃν εἶπον* and *ὅς*), ver. 16 (*ὅτι*), and ver. 18 (*μονογενὴς Θεός*). We were fully warranted, therefore, in protesting beforehand against the prevailing prejudice in favour of the ancient Alexandrine manuscripts.

this privilege; and thus everything proceeds always from the Father (John v. 26). In our exposition we have kept within the limits of positive revelation, and have merely sought to show the admirable harmony of the facts which it contains.

[1] Lerminier.

FIRST PART.

I. 19–IV. 54.

FIRST MANIFESTATIONS OF THE WORD.—THE BIRTH OF FAITH.—FIRST SYMPTOMS OF UNBELIEF.

COMPARED with the two following parts, one of which specially traces the development of unbelief (v.-xii.), the other that of faith (xiii.–xvii.), this first part has a more general character. It serves as basis and point of departure for the two others. Jesus is declared to be the Messiah by John the Baptist; a first group of disciples is formed round Him. His glory shines forth in some miraculous manifestations in the circle of private life. Then He inaugurates His public ministry in the temple at Jerusalem. But this attempt being frustrated, He confines Himself to teaching while working miracles, and to gathering round Him new adherents by means of baptism. Finally, observing that even in this more modest form His activity gives offence to the dominant party at Jerusalem, He retires to Galilee, after sowing by the way the germs of faith in Samaria. This summary is enough to justify the title which we have given to this whole first part, and to show its mixed character as compared with those following.

The evangelist himself seems to have meant to divide it into two cycles by the well-marked correlation between the two remarks: ii. 11 and iv. 54, placed, the one at the end of the narrative of the marriage at Cana: "*This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth His glory; and His disciples believed on Him there;*" the other, which concludes this entire part, after the healing of the nobleman's son: "*This is again the second miracle that Jesus did, when He was come out of Judæa into Galilee.*" By the evident correspondence of those two sayings, the evangelist shows that there were in those first times of the ministry of

Jesus two sojourns in Judæa, which both ended in a return to Galilee, and that each of those returns was signalized by a miracle wrought at Cana. This evidence of the historian's mind ought to be our guide. We therefore divide this first part into two cycles: the one comprising the facts related i. 19–ii. 11; the other, the narratives ii. 12–iv. 54. In the first, Jesus, introduced by John the Baptist to His ministry, carries it out without going beyond the inner circle of His first disciples and His family. The second relates His first steps in His public ministry.

FIRST CYCLE.

I. 19–II. 11.

This cycle embraces three sections: 1st, The testimony rendered to Jesus by John the Baptist, i. 19–37; 2d, The first personal manifestations of Jesus and the faith of His first disciples, i. 38–52; 3d, His first miraculous sign, ii. 1–11. The facts related in these three sections cover a week, which, as Bengel has remarked, may be considered the counterpart of the final passion-week. The one might be called the Messianic bridal week; the other is the time of separation which was announced from the beginning by Jesus: "*When the bridegroom shall be taken away, then shall the friends of the bridegroom fast.*"

FIRST SECTION.

I. 19–37.—THE TESTIMONIES OF JOHN THE BAPTIST.

These testimonies are three in number, and were given on three successive days (see vv. 39 and 35: "*The next day*"). These three days, ever memorable to the church, had left an ineffaceable impression on the heart of the evangelist. On the first he had heard the forerunner solemnly proclaim before a deputation of the Sanhedrim that the Messiah was present,

but unknown by every one except John himself (ver. 26); and this saying had sent a thrill through him as well as through the assembled multitude. On the morrow, a day more important still, Jesus had been pointed out personally by His forerunner as the Messiah; and faith, trained by the declaration of the preceding day, had enlightened with its first ray the heart of John and that of all the Baptist's hearers. Finally, on the third day, in consequence of a new declaration given forth by his first master, John had left him to join the new Master whom he pointed out to him.

Why did the author choose the first of those three days as the starting-point of his narrative? If it is true that the object of his narrative, as we have concluded from his own declaration, xx. 30, 31, is to account for the manner in which the faith was formed which the apostles now proclaim throughout the whole world, and that in order to develope the same faith in his readers, we cannot but own that here is really the normal starting-point for his history. Faith did not at all begin with John's baptism, not even with the baptism of Jesus. The three days which are here described by the evangelist were not merely the birthdays of his own faith and of that of the apostles, but of faith in general within the bosom of humanity. The Messiah *proclaimed*, then *pointed out*, finally *followed*: such is the course of the narrative.

I. *First Testimony.*—Vv. 19–28.

When unfolding the contents of faith in his prologue, the apostle had produced a testimony given by John the Baptist which contained, as Baur well says, "the idea of the absolute pre-existence of the Messiah," and consequently the real thought of the prologue, that of Christ's divinity. It is that testimony, quoted at ver. 15, which he now proceeds to relate, indicating the place and day when it was delivered. Rather we should say the days; for the testimony is not merely that of the first day (vv. 26 and 27). It is also and especially, as we have already seen, that of the day following (ver. 30). When repeating, on the latter day, his declaration of the previous evening, the forerunner completed it, and gave it forth exactly as it is reproduced in the prologue.

Ver. 19. "*And this is the record of John, when*[1] *the Jews sent*[2] *priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask Him, Who art Thou?*" It is strange to find the narrative beginning with *and*. But this is explained by the connection which we have just indicated between the following narrative and the testimony quoted ver. 15. The narrative strikes its roots, so to speak, into the prologue. Is not the faith expressed in the saying of ver. 15 exactly that whose origin and development the history is about to trace? *Καὶ αὕτη* may be thus paraphrased: "And this is the tenor of the record." . . . What gave to this declaration of John the Baptist a peculiar importance was its official character. It was given forth in presence of a deputation of the Sanhedrim, and in reply to an express question proceeding from that body, the religious head of the Jewish nation. The Sanhedrim, of whose existence we find no earlier traces than in the times of Antipater and Herod (Josephus, *Antiquities*, xiv. 9. 4), was no doubt a continuation or renewal of a more ancient institution. We are reminded of the tribunal of seventy elders established by Moses (Num. xi. 16). Under Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xix. 8) there is also mention made of a supreme tribunal sitting at Jerusalem, and composed of a certain number of Levites, priests, and fathers of Israel. Comp. probably also Ezek. viii. 11 et seq.: "*Seventy men of the ancients of the house of Israel.*" In Maccabees (1 Macc. xii. 6; 2 Macc. i. 10, iv. 44, etc.) the body called *γερουσία, senate*, plays a part similar to that of those ancient tribunals, though we cannot establish a historical continuity between those institutions. In the time of Jesus, this senate, called the *Sanhedrim*, was composed of seventy-one members, including the president (Tract. *Sanhed.* i. 6). These members were of three classes: 1st, The *chief priests* (*ἀρχιερεῖς*),—a term which probably denotes the ex-high priests and the members of the highest sacerdotal families; 2d, The *elders* of the people (*πρεσβύτεροι, ἄρχοντες τοῦ λαοῦ*),—a term which undoubtedly comprehends the other members in general, not only of the laity, but also priests or Levites; 3d, The *scribes* (*γραμματεῖς*), specially denoting experts in the law, or professional jurists. The high priest

[1] Origen reads *ὅτε* once; elsewhere, *ὅτι*.

[2] B C, It[aliq.], Syr., and other vss. add after *ἀπέστειλαν*: *πρὸς αὐτόν*.

presided *ex officio*.[1] The Sanhedrim had till now winked at the work of John the Baptist. But seeing that things were daily taking a graver turn, and that the people began even to ask if John were not the Christ (comp. Luke iii. 15), they thought themselves bound at length to use their powers, and to put him to an official examination about his mission. Jesus (ver. 33) refers to this step, which at a later period formed the ground of His own refusal to reply to a similar interrogatory (Matt. xxi. 23 et seq.). The Mishna says expressly, that "the power of judging a *tribe*, a *false prophet*, and a *chief priest*, pertains to the tribunal of the seventy-one."—*Sanhed.* i. 5. The designation "*the Jews*" plays an important part in the fourth Gospel. This name, according to its etymology, properly denotes only the members of the tribe of Judah; but after the return from the captivity it was applied to the whole people, because the greater part of the Israelites who returned belonged to this tribe. It is in this general sense that we find it ii. 6: "*After the manner of the purifying of the Jews;*" ii. 13: "*The Jews' passover;*" iii. 1: "*A ruler of the Jews.*" In this political sense the term may even be extended to the Galileans: vi. 52. But the name in our Gospel takes a religious signification. The author attaches to it the notion of a more or less pronounced antipathy to Jesus and His cause; and that quite naturally, for the centre of the hostility to which Jesus was subjected was at Jerusalem, and in the province of Judea. From this odious sense which the author attached to the name of Jew, it has been attempted to prove that he could not himself belong to this nation.[2] But after the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jewish nation, politically regarded, ceased to exist; and John, belonging himself in faith to a new community, could well speak of the Jews, in a religious sense, as of a body which had become alien to him. The Judæo-Christian apostle is still more severe in the Apocalypse to his old fellow-countrymen, whom he calls "*the synagogue of Satan*" (iii. 9). The words, *from Jerusalem*,

[1] The old view, according to which the Sanhedrim had an elective president and vice-president (the *Nasi* and the *Av-Beth-Din*), seems now to have been refuted by Kuenen and Schürer. See *Lehrbuch der neutest. Zeitgesch.*, by Schürer, sec. 123.

[2] Fischer, *Tübinger Zeitschrift* 1840, and so Hilgenfeld. We have refuted this objection in the Introd. p. 171.

depend not on the word *the Jews*, but on the verb *sent*. The intention of this regimen is to bring out the solemnity of the course taken; it proceeded from the centre of the theocracy. Levites were joined with priests. It has often been thought that they played only the part of officers. But in several passages of the Old Testament (2 Chron. xxii. 7–9, xxxv. 3; Neh. viii. 7), it appears that it was the Levites who were charged with instructing the people in the law; whence Hengstenberg has concluded, not without reason, that the scribes so often mentioned in the New Testament belonged generally to this order, and that in this character, and consequently as members of the Sanhedrim, some of them figured in the deputation. The question which they put to John the Baptist refers to the expectation, at that time reigning in Israel, of the Messiah, and the extraordinary messengers who were to precede His coming. "*Who art thou?*" signifies in the context: What expected person art thou? We shall see in ver. 25 what perplexity this question was fitted to cause John if he refused to declare his title.

Origen, who, as we have seen, placed the last three verses of the prologue in the mouth of John the Baptist, believed, consequently, that the following testimony (ver. 19 et seq.) was a new one later than that of vv. 15–18. He therefore put a period after the word *John*, undoubtedly converting these first words: "*And this is the record of John*," into an appendix to the preceding testimony. Then, with the ὅτε, *when*, or the τότε, *then* (for so he thought he might modify the text), he began a new proposition, the main text of which was to be found at ver. 20: "*he confessed.*" But the καί, *and*, before this verb, renders such a construction impossible. For never is the copula καί in John the sign of the apodosis, not even in vi. 57. As to the change of ὅτε into τότε, it is entirely arbitrary. We shall see afterwards the consequences of all those exegetical errors of Origen. The words πρὸς αὐτόν, *to him*, added by some of the Alexandrines, are justly condemned by Tischendorf, Meyer, etc. Meyer is wrong in making the καὶ ὡμολόγησε still depend on ὅτε. This construction would make the sentence drag heavily.

Ver. 20. "*And he confessed, and denied not; and con-*

fessed,[1] *I am not the Christ.*" [2] Before stating the contents of John's answer, the evangelist indicates its characteristics: it was ready, frank, and categorical. The first "*he confessed*" indicates in effect the spontaneity and eagerness with which the declaration was made. The same thought follows in a negative form, "*he denied not,*" to show that he did not for an instant yield to the temptation which he might have had to deny. Finally, the second "*he confessed*" is added to the first in order to attach to it the profession which follows. This remarkable form of narrative (comp. i. 7, 8) can only be explained from a regard to people who, in the circle in which the apostle lived, were inclined to give to the person of John the Baptist a higher importance than belonged to his real dignity. According to the reading of the Alexandrines and of Origen, we must translate: "*It is not I* who am the Christ." This answer would be suitable if the question had been: "*Is it thou* who art the Christ?" But the question was simply, "*Who art thou?*" and the true answer is consequently that which is found in the T. R.: "*I am not* the Christ;" that is to say: "I am something, no doubt, but not the Christ."

Ver. 21. "*And they asked him, What then?* [3] *Art thou* [4] *Elias? And he saith, I am not. Art thou the prophet? And he answered, No.*" Several commentators understand the question τί οὖν (*what then?*) in the same sense, or nearly the same, as the preceding: "*What art thou, then?*" But it is unnatural to take the neuter τί in this sense. De Wette finds in these words only an adverbial phrase: "*What then!*" This sense is insipid. Rather, with Meyer, we must understand ἐστί: "What is the matter? What extraordinary thing, then, is passing?" This form of interrogation betrays impatience. Malachi had announced (iv. 5) the coming of Elias as the herald of the great Messianic day; and we know from Justin's *Dialogue* with the Jew Trypho, that according to a popular opinion the Messiah was to remain hidden till pointed out and consecrated by this prophet. Several passages

[1] L omits καὶ, and ℵ, Syr^{cur}, Or. the second καὶ ὡμολόγησεν.

[2] ℵ A B C L X Δ, It^{plerique}, Cop. Or. (thrice) read ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμί, while eleven other Mjj. and the T. R. place εἰμὶ before ἐγώ.

[3] B reads σὺ οὖν τί (*What art thou, then?*).

[4] ℵ B L reject σὺ after εἶ.

of the Gospels (Matt. xvi. 14; Mark vi. 15) prove that some other prophet of the ancient times besides was expected to reappear—Jeremiah, for example. Of these expected personages there was one who was specially designated *the prophet*. Some distinguished him from the Messiah (John vii. 40, 41); others confounded him with the Messiah (vi. 14). The personage in question was undoubtedly the one to whom the promise applied given in Deut. xviii. 18 (the prophet like unto Moses). Of course the people did not think of a second Elias or a new Moses in the spiritual sense, as when the angel says of John the Baptist (Luke i. 17): "*He shall go before Him in the spirit and power of Elias.*" It was the person himself who was to reappear in flesh and bone. How could the Baptist have affirmed in this literal sense his identity with one or other of those ancient personages? As to entering into the domain of theological distinctions, he could not; and it was not in keeping with his character. His answer, therefore, on this point also must be negative.

Vv. 22, 23. "*They said, therefore, unto him, Who art thou? that we may give an answer to them that sent us. What sayest thou of thyself? He said, I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias.*" The deputies had now exhausted the suppositions furnished by the generally received Messianic programme. It only remains to them to put to John a general question which forces him from the negative attitude which he has been maintaining: "*Who art thou?*" that is to say: "What personage art thou?" The extraordinary conduct of John in Israel formed a sufficient ground for this question. John answers with a saying of Isaiah, which is at once the explanation and proof of his mission. The meaning of the prophetic passage is this: Jehovah is on the point of appearing to manifest His glory. At the moment preceding His appearance, without any one showing himself on the scene, a voice is heard which invites Israel to prepare the way by which her Lord is to come. The event in question in this description is not the return from the captivity: it is the Messianic appearance of Jehovah. As in the East, before the arrival of a sovereign, the roads were made straight and level, so Israel is to prepare for her divine King a welcome which

shall be worthy of Him; and the function of the mysterious voice is to engage her on this preparatory work, lest the signal grace which is approaching should turn to judgment. John applies this saying of Isaiah to himself the more willingly, that it falls in perfectly with his desire to keep his person out of view, and to let nothing appear except his message: "*a voice.*" The words *in the wilderness* may be connected, in the Hebrew as well as in the Greek, either with the verb which precedes: *cry,* or with that which follows: *make straight.* The sense is the same in either case, for the order sounds forth in the place where it is to be executed. The connection with the preceding verb is more natural, especially in the Greek. Wilderness in the East denotes uncultivated spaces, those vast tracts which serve for pasture, and which are crossed only by winding paths, and not by roads worthy of a sovereign. Such is the emblem of the moral state of the people; Jehovah's entrance is not yet prepared for in their hearts. A collective and national repentance can alone pave the way for Him. By fixing his abode in the wilderness, the forerunner meant to indicate more clearly, by this literal conformity to the prophetic emblem, the *moral* fulfilment of the prophecy. Does the form of quotation: "*as said*" . . ., belong to the narrative of the evangelist or to the Baptist's own answer? In favour of the second alternative, it may be said that the forerunner had more need himself to prove his own claims at that time than the evangelist had so long after. To speak thus was, on the part of John, to deliver his mandate and to declare his marching order. It was to proclaim to those deputies, experts in the knowledge of the law and the prophets, that if he was not *personally* any one of the expected personages, his mission was nevertheless directly connected with the near appearance of the Messiah. This was all which, from a moral point of view, it concerned the Sanhedrim and the people to know. Both were forewarned.

The preceding examination bore on the general *rôle* of John the Baptist. The deputation subjects him to a second and more special one relative to the *rite* of baptism introduced by him. The evangelist prefaces this new phase of the interview by a remark relating to the religious character of the members of the deputation.

Ver. 24. "*And they which*[1] *were sent were of the Pharisees.*" If we translate thus according to the T. R., which is supported by the majority of the Mjj., all the Mnn., and most of the vss., making the participle ἀπεσταλμένοι, defined by the art. οἱ, the subject of the phrase, the object of this remark can only be to explain the question which follows. It is the constant habit of John thus to supply, at every succeeding stage, the circumstances fitted to explain the narrative; comp. i. 41, 45, iv. 30, ix. 14, xi. 5, 18, xiii. 23, etc. The Pharisees being the ultra-conservatives in Israel, none would be more offended than they at the innovation which John took the liberty of making by introducing baptism. Washings, no doubt, formed part of Jewish worship. Some even allege that Gentile proselytes were subjected to a complete bath on occasion of their passing over to Judaism. But the application of this symbol of entire pollution to the members of the theocratic people was so strange an innovation, that it must have awakened in the highest degree the susceptibility of the authorities who were the guardians of religious rites, and very specially that of the party most attached to tradition. Besides, the Pharisaic element predominated in the deputation which the Sanhedrim had chosen. We see also how skilfully planned was the course of examination: first of all, the question of his mission; thereafter, only that of the rite. The order of the narrative thus admits of a perfectly natural explanation; but Origen, still led astray here by the false interpretation which he had given of the end of the prologue, imagined that in ver. 24 an entirely new deputation was introduced, different from that of ver. 19; and that this deputation was sent exclusively by the Pharisees. He therefore translated: "*And there were also there some sent* of the Pharisees." The art. οἱ should in this sense be rejected. And hence, no doubt, has arisen the reading of the Alex. MSS. which reject this word. But this explanation is inadmissible. It would assume that the deputies mentioned, ver. 24, remained there like mutes during the whole of the previous interview, which is absolutely improbable. And even after the alteration of the true text, to which it is obliged to have recourse, it still remains grammatically very forced.

[1] ℵ A B C L and Or. reject οἱ before ἀπεσταλμένοι.

Ver. 25. "*And they asked him,*[1] *and said unto him, Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not the Christ, nor Elias, neither the prophet?*"[2] The strictest guardians of rites conceded to the Messiah or to any one of His forerunners the right of innovating in the matter of observances; and if John had declared himself one of those personages, they would have contented themselves with demanding his credentials, and would have kept silence about his baptism, which would be authenticated along with his mission. Indeed, this very verse seems to prove that, founding on such sayings as Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26, and Zech. xiii. 1, the Jews expected a great national lustration to inaugurate the kingdom of the Messiah. John the Baptist having expressly repudiated the honour of being one of the expected prophets, the deputation was entitled now to put to him the question: "*Why baptizest thou then?*" In the *then* there is included the connection of ideas which we have just established. According to the reading of the T. R., *neither, nor*, the thought is this: "The supposition that thou art the Christ being set aside, thy baptism can be explained only on this, that thou art one or other of the two expected forerunners; if, then, thou art *neither* the one *nor* the other, why . . . etc.?" It was not easy to apprehend this delicate meaning of the *disjunctive* negation; and the difficulty gave rise to the Alex. correction *οὐδέ, οὐδέ, nor, moreover*, which is only to add negation to negation. The position of John the Baptist in relation to this question, after his previous answer, was difficult:

Vv. 26, 27. "*John answered them, saying. Yea, I baptize with water:*[3] *there standeth*[4] *one among you,*[5] *whom ye know not; He*[6] *it is, who, coming after me, is preferred before me,*[7] *whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose.*" This

[1] ℵ rejects ηρωτησαν αυτον και (the copyist has confounded the two και).

[2] Instead of ουτε ουτι, which is read by the T. R., after the most of the Mjj. and Mnn., the reading in A B C L and Or. (six times) is ουδε ουδε.

[3] ℵ alone: εν τω υδατι, instead of εν υδατι.

[4] B L T^{b}: στηκει (*stat*); ℵ G: ιστηκει (*stetit*); T. R. with all the others: ιστηκειν.

[5] After μεσος, T. R. reads δε, with all the authorities, except ℵ B C L and Or. (ten times), who reject this word.

[6] T. R. reads after οιδατι, αυτος εστιν, with 13 Mjj. the Mnn. It. Vg. Syr. Or. (once); these words are rejected by ℵ B C L T^{b}, Syr^{cur}, and Or. (six times).

[7] After ερχομενος, T. R. adds ος εμπροσθεν μου γεγονεν, with the same authorities nearly; these words are rejected by the same authorities which reject αυτος εστι.

answer has been judged somewhat obscure and embarrassed. De Wette thinks even that it does not correspond with the question. The generally received explanation is this: "My water-baptism does not in any case impinge on that of the Messiah, which is of an entirely different nature; it prepares for it merely." Thus John is represented as in a way apologizing to the Sanhedrim for his baptism in name of the more important baptism, that of the Spirit, which is to be carried out by the Messiah. But, in the first place, this would be to evade the question proposed; and de Wette's criticism would be well founded. For the baptism of John was attacked in itself, and not because of its relation to that of the Messiah. Then the words ἐν ὕδατι, *with water*, would require to be placed first: "It is *only with water* that I baptize;" and the Spirit-baptism would necessarily be mentioned in the following proposition as an antithesis. Finally, it would not be in keeping with the Baptist's character to seek to shelter himself under the insignificance of his function, and to pass off his baptism as an inoffensive novelty. Everything is full of dignity, solemnity, and even threatening, in this reply, when rightly understood. It is meant to exhibit the gravity of the present situation, into the mystery of which he alone is initiated, and in which he has a part so important to play. It is the continuation of his call to repentance, ver. 23: "*Make straight the way of the Lord*," as well as the answer to the question of the Pharisees. In the very fact that he announces to them the *presence* of the Messiah in the midst of them, their question is resolved. If the Christ is there, He is known by him and him alone,—the Messianic time has come; he is its initiator, and his baptism is thereby justified. This conviction of the grandeur of the situation and of his function is expressed with energy in the ἐγώ, *I*, placed first, not as is thought in contrast to the Messiah,—for the entirely different baptism of the latter would require to be mentioned thereafter,—but in this sense: "You ask me why I baptize? I do so, not without knowing why: it is because He is there, mark it well, He for whom you wait!" Therefore ἐγώ: "*I*, who know the situation of affairs." We have rendered the force of this pronoun by the affirmation *yea!* Such, also, is the reason why the verb *I baptize* is placed before the regimen: *with water*. The

antithesis between water-baptism and Spirit-baptism is entirely foreign to this passage. According to this view, the δέ, *but*, ought undoubtedly to be rejected, as it is by the Alex. This adversative particle has crept in under the sway of the supposed antithesis between the two baptisms. The *but* might yet be supported in this sense: "I baptize with water, and I know well myself that it is a grave matter! *But* I am not doing so lightly; for He is present, He who should come." This sense appears somewhat forced. The words *among you*, accompanied, as they no doubt were, with a significant look, by which the forerunner seemed to search in the crowd for Him of whom he was speaking, must have produced profound emotion. The term ἕστηκεν or στήκει, *He stands there*, is more dramatic than *He is there*. The important words are these: *Whom ye know not*. The accent is on the word *ye*, in opposition to John himself, who knows Him. Thus he and his baptism are accredited together. This saying necessarily assumes that the baptism of Jesus was an accomplished fact at the time when John was speaking. For it was in this very act that, agreeably to the divine promise (ver. 33), the Messiah had been revealed to him. He himself declares, vv. 31, 33, that up till that time he did not know Him. We must not therefore place the baptism of Jesus, as Olshausen and Hengstenberg do, on that day or on the day following, or, with Ewald, between vv. 31, 32, and Bäumlein, between vv. 28, 29. As little is it necessary to identify this testimony with the declarations of John, reported by the Synoptics, and which preceded the baptism of Jesus. There, he said vaguely, "There cometh one after me." Here the prophecy takes quite a different character; "He is present, and I know Him." Here, then, is the first testimony which refers to the person of Jesus directly; it is the true starting-point of faith in Him. What are we to think of the omission of the words: *He it is* (αὐτός ἐστι), and: *who was before me*, by the Alex.? A critical prejudice exists which regards the shortest reading as the most exact. This rule is far from being always true. So in this case I suspect the Alexandrine text of being mutilated by a hand which thought it was purifying it. And that hand is no other than Origen's, already guilty of so many mistakes in this chapter. Distrusting the text, such as he found it repro-

duced in his time (see p. 321), and in consequence of certain parallels between John and the Synoptics, such as this: "*whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose,*" he regarded this testimony as the reproduction of that of the Synoptics, and rejected as an interpolation (arising from ver. 15) all that went beyond it. The words: *He it is,* of the T. R., serve to recall the declarations which had preceded the baptism of Jesus, and to establish the identity of the personage indicated here with the Messiah, long announced by John. It is the same with the expressions: "*He who cometh after me,*" and: "*He of whom I am not worthy*" . . . By the expression: "*to unloose the latchet of the sandals,*" John means to designate the humble office of a slave. On the pleonasm of οὗ and αὐτοῦ, Bäumlein rightly says: "imitation of the Hebrew construction." Philologists debate the question whether the form ἄξιος ἵνα implies a weakening of the sense of the conj. ἵνα, which would here become a simple paraphrase of the infinitive (*worthy to unloose*),—so Bäumlein,—or whether this conjunction always preserves the notion of intention (Meyer). The first rests on the usage of the later Greek and on the *vá* of modern Greek, which, with the verb in the subjunctive, takes the place of the infinitive. Nevertheless, we think, with Meyer, that the notion of intention is never altogether lost in the ἵνα of the N. T.

Ver. 28. "*These things were done in Bethany,*[1] *beyond Jordan,*[2] *where John was baptizing.*" The notice (ver. 28) is certainly not suggested to John by a geographical interest; it is inspired by the solemnity of the preceding scene, and by the extraordinary gravity of this official testimony addressed to the representatives of the Sanhedrim and of the entire nation. It was to this declaration, indeed, that the saying of the prologue applied: "*That all men through Him might believe.*" If the people had been open to faith, this testimony, proceeding from such a mouth, would have sufficed to kindle this divine fire in Israel. As to the difference of the two readings, *Bethany* and *Bethabara,* Origen himself relates that

[1] The reading Βηθανια is found in almost all the Mjj., the most of the Mnn. It. Vg. Cop. Syr^{sch}, etc. Only the Mjj. ℵ T^{b} U Λ Π, some Mnn. Syr^{cur}, read with T. R. Βηθαβαρα.

[2] ℵ, Syr^{cur}, add περαμου after Ιορδανου.

almost all the old MSS. read Bethany, but that having sought a place of that name on the banks of the Jordan, he had not found it, while a place was pointed out called Bethabara, where tradition alleged that John had baptized. It is therefore almost certain that the reading *Bethabara* was substituted for the original reading *Bethany* in a certain number of documents, and that the substitution is the work of Origen. The Roman war had made a host of ancient localities disappear even to the very name. In the time of Jesus there existed undoubtedly two Bethanys, as there were two Bethlehems, two Bethsaidas, two Antiochs, two Ramas, two Canas. Different etymologies are given of the name of Bethany, such as *place of dates* or *of poverty*, etc. These meanings may suit the Bethany near Jerusalem; as to the Bethany near the Jordan, it is more probable that its name is derived from *Beth-Onijah* (אניה, *navis*), *place of the ferry-boat* (see Introd. p. 102). This last sense would almost coincide with that of Bethabara, *place of the ford*. Bethabara is named in Judg. vii. 24. This name was perhaps connected with the passage of the children of Israel at this place on their entry into the land of Canaan.

II. *Second Testimony.*—Vv. 29–34.

How are we to explain the fact that the deputies of the Sanhedrim left John without asking him who the person was to whom he referred? Either they did not care to know, or they despised the man who spoke to them in such a way. In either case, their unbelief would date from this event. After their departure the forerunner remained with his disciples and the multitude who had been present at the scene, and from the morrow onwards his testimony took a more categorical character. He no longer said simply, "The Messiah has come," but, seeing Jesus approaching, he said, "There He is!" He characterizes Him first as to His work (ver. 29), then as to His person (ver. 30); he relates afterwards how he came to know Him, and on what foundation the testimony rests which he gives to Him (vv. 31–33); finally, he shows the importance to his hearers of the act which he has just performed in unburdening himself before them of such a message (ver. 34).

Ver. 29. "*The next day he*[1] *seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.*" The very next day after that on which John had proclaimed the presence of the Messiah among the people, Jesus approached His forerunner, who recognised Him and declared Him to be the Messiah. The words: *coming to him*, have perplexed commentators. Some have wrongly understood: to be baptized (see above). Baur saw in them no other meaning than the following: to receive John's testimony, and naturally found in this detail a proof of the purely ideal character of the narrative. But what does the fact assume? What is perfectly simple — namely, that Jesus, after having been baptized, previously to this meeting had removed from John for a certain time, and after the interval He returned on this very day to His forerunner. Now this is exactly what is confirmed by the synoptical account. Jesus, after His baptism, had in fact retired to the solitude of the desert, where He passed several weeks, and it was now that He reappeared to begin His work as Redeemer. That with this intention He should return to the presence of John, is of all things the most natural. Was it not he who was to open up the way for Him to Israel? and was it not beside him that He might hope to find the instruments who were indispensable to Him for the accomplishment of His task? Jesus Himself (x. 3) describes John as *the porter* who opens the door of the fold to the shepherd, so that he has not to climb over the wall of the enclosure like the robber. The words: *coming unto him*, are therefore perfectly in keeping with the situation, and do not at all refer to a simple walk invented as a basis for the testimony which follows. Comp. Lücke, who also connects this detail with the account of the temptation.

On the one hand, the designation which John used to point out Jesus as the Messiah must certainly have been intelligible to those who surrounded him; on the other, it must be in accordance with the impression which he had himself received on the occasion of his first meeting with

[1] The words ὁ Ἰωάννης of the T. R., which are omitted in a large number of Mjj. and Mnn., as well Alexandrine as Byzantine, and in most vss., are one of those additions, frequent in the Byzantine text, which have been brought about by the necessities of reading in public worship.

Jesus. To fulfil the first of these conditions, the expression: "*the Lamb of God*," must contain an allusion to some saying or deed of the Old Testament usually referred to the Messiah. The interpretation of the term which best satisfies this condition is certainly that according to which John the Baptist here reminds his hearers of the *Servant of the Lord*, described Isa. liii. Before the polemic against the Christians had driven Jewish commentators to another explanation, they referred the passage Isa. lii. 13–liii. 12 to the Messiah. This is the unanimous admission of Kimchi, Jarchi, Aben Ezra, and Abarbanel. The last mentioned says: "Jonathan, the son of Usiel, referred this prophecy to the Messiah who is to come; and this is also the opinion of our sages of happy memory." (See Eisenmenger, *Entdeckt. Judenth.* II. Th. p. 758; Lücke, vol. i. p. 406.)[1] We need not demonstrate here the truth of this explanation, and the insoluble difficulties which beset every contrary interpretation. It is enough for us that it prevailed among the ancient Jews. Thence it follows that the Baptist's allusion could easily be understood. The Servant of the Lord is represented in that chapter as "*bearing on Himself alone the iniquity of us all*," and described in ver. 7 in these words: "*He is led as a lamb to the slaughter, as a sheep before her shearers is dumb.*" From those two sayings of Isaiah taken together there results directly the designation used on this solemn occasion by John the Baptist. Some commentators have alleged that the word *lamb*, both here and in Isaiah, denoted only the perfect gentleness of Jesus, His patience under suffering, without any reference to the idea of sacrifice. So Gabler: "Here is the man full of gentleness, who will patiently bear the ills to which He shall be subjected by human perversity;" and Kuinoel: "Behold the innocent and pious being who will take away wickedness

[1] Comp. especially Wünsche, *die Leiden des Messias*, 1870, p. 55 et seq. By a multitude of rabbinical sayings he furnishes proof that the passages Isa. lii. 13–liii. 12, Zech. ix. 9 (*lowly, riding on an ass*), and xii. 10 ("*on me whom they have pierced*"), were from time immemorial unanimously referred to the Messiah and His expiatory sufferings. The very attempt to distinguish between two Messianic personages, the one *the son of Joseph* or Ephraim, whose lot is to suffer; and the other *the son of Judah*, to whom the glory is ascribed, is only a later expedient (dating from the second century; comp. Wünsche, p. 109) to reconcile this undisputed interpretation with the idea of the glorious Messiah.

from the earth;" Ewald, nearly the same. But none of those explanations sufficiently accounts for the art. *ὁ, the known, expected lamb,* nor brings out the relation established by the text between the figure of the *lamb* and the act of *taking away sin.* Some commentators have supposed that the figure used by John was borrowed, not from Isa. liii., but from sacrifices generally in which the lamb was used as a victim. But those sacrifices had not a relation to the Messiah special enough to make the name of which John makes use in this case sufficiently clear. There is but one sacrifice which could correspond in any degree to this condition, that, namely, of the paschal lamb. It is true, but mistaken in our opinion, that the expiatory character of the paschal sacrifice is denied. "*The blood,*" saith the Lord (Ex. xii. 13), "*shall be to you for a token upon the houses where ye are; and when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and the plague shall not be upon you to destroy you.*" How, after such a saying, can it be maintained that the blood of this lamb had no expiatory value? "The paschal sacrifice," Hengstenberg rightly says, "was the basis of the whole sacrificial system, the basis of the ancient covenant itself. . . . Hence it possessed certain characters which the ordinary expiatory sacrifices had not—for example, the sacramental feast, the emblem of communion with Jehovah. And this it is which has led commentators astray on the matter." But is it necessary to choose between the allusion to Isa. liii. and the reference to the paschal lamb? Did not Isaiah himself borrow from the sacrifice of the paschal lamb the essential features in his picture of the Lord's Servant suffering for the expiation of the sins of the people? The two explanations are not, therefore, contradictory; we need not even reject wholly the explanation given by Gabler, Ewald, etc.; for it is indubitable that of the clean animals used as victims the lamb was that which, by its characteristic innocence and gentleness, presented the emblem most fully corresponding to the part of the Messiah, as it is here described by John the Baptist. Nevertheless, we persist in thinking, with Meyer, in opposition to Olshausen, Luthardt, Hofmann, that it is essentially on the delineation of the fifty-third of Isaiah that this expression rests; comp. Matt. viii. 17; Luke xxii. 37; Acts viii. 32; 1 Pet. ii. 22, et seq. The complement *τοῦ Θεοῦ, of God,* is the gen.

of possession; in this sacrifice it is not man who offers and sacrifices; it is God who gives, and who gives of His own. Comp. 1 Pet. i. 19, 20; Rom. viii. 32. But after all those facts have been taken into account, the need is still felt of explaining the choice of the term by some personal impression on the mind of the forerunner. And for this end it suffices to recall what must have passed between Jesus and him on occasion of the baptism. Every Israelite, before receiving this seal, required *to confess his sins* to John the Baptist (comp. Matt. iii. 6). Jesus on presenting Himself, like every other Jew, should have done what every neophyte did. How was this possible? Not being able to confess His personal sin, He unfolded, no doubt, that of Israel, that of the world as He understood it, before the astonished view of John. This description, traced with the unequalled holiness, love, compassion, and gentleness of Jesus, must have made a deep impression on John, whose knowledge and love were beneath the level on which stood this unknown pilgrim. And no doubt it was this contrast, vividly felt between himself and Jesus, which, amid all the Messianic designations which the Old Testament might have furnished him, led him to prefer this: "*The Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.*" It is remarkable that this title *Lamb*, under which the evangelist learned to know Jesus for the first time, is that by which the Saviour is designated preferentially in the Apocalypse. The chord which had vibrated at this decisive hour within the very depths of his being, continued to vibrate within him to his latest breath.

Commentators are not at one about the meaning of the word αἴρειν (*to lift, lift away*) in our passage. Some hold that it expresses the notion of expiation. In this case we must translate: "Who *bears* the sin of the world." Comp. Isa. liii. 4: "He *hath borne* our griefs." Ver. 6: "The Lord hath *laid on Him* the iniquity of us all." Ver. 11: "He *shall bear* their iniquities," etc. Others allege, 1 John iii. 5: "*Ye know that Jesus Christ was manifested to take away our sins* (ἵνα ἄρῃ)," and find here rather the sanctification of the world; they translate: "Who *bears away* the sin" ... If John had thought specially of the act of expiation he would probably have used the term φέρειν, *to bear*, which the LXX.

employ in the passages quoted. He is thinking, therefore, rather of the removing of sin; but how could he forget that, agreeably to the whole fifty-third of Isaiah, to which he is referring, this end can only be reached by means of expiation? To remove the burden from those on whom it presses, He must needs charge Himself with it. The first explanation, therefore, contains the second. The pres. part. *αἴρων, bearing away,* might be explained as the present of competency. But it is simpler to regard it as a historical present in this sense, that all the holy life of Jesus, from its beginning, was the condition of the efficacy of His expiatory death. In any case, this participle is in direct connection with *τοῦ Θεοῦ, of God:* "The Lamb whom God sends with the task of taking away." . . .

The burden to be removed is designated in a way which is imposing and sublime: *the sin of the world.* This substantive in the singular, *the sin,* presents the apostasy of humanity in its profound unity—that is, if we may so speak, sin *in the mass,* including all the sins of all the sinners on the earth. Do they not all spring from one and the same root? We must beware of understanding by *ἁμαρτία,* as de Wette does, *the punishment* of sin. This word embraces at once the punishment, the guilt, and the sin itself. It follows from the words: *of the world,* that the Baptist extends the influence of the Messianic work to the whole of humanity. This idea has been regarded as too universalistic in such a mouth, and set down as due to the evangelist. It is certainly astonishing to find a scruple like this raised by authors who apply the fifty-third of Isaiah to the Jewish people suffering for the *sins of the Gentiles!* Had it not been said long before to Abraham: "In thy seed shall *all the families of the earth* be blessed"? And did not the still more ancient promise made to Adam: "*The seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the serpent,*" contain the idea of the most absolute universalism? The very mission of the prophets was to maintain this universalistic tendency within the bosom of theocratic particularism; prophetism was the counterpoise put by God Himself to the exclusiveness which might be engendered by the reign of the law. And who really are *the kings* and *the many nations* (*Gojim rabbim*), Isa. lii. 15, who are made to exult by the

expiatory sacrifice of the servant of the Lord, if they are not Gentile kings and all the nations *of the world?* Comp. on this point the decisive and magnificent prophecy, Isa. xix. 24, 25. Are we to suppose the Baptist to have been surpassed in clearness of vision by Isaiah, he who was *more than a prophet?* And what are we to suppose the meaning of that threatening or promise which the Synoptics put into his mouth, if it signifies anything: "*God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham*"?

It has been objected to the explanation which we have just given of this verse, that the idea of a suffering Messiah was not popularly known in Israel, as is proved by the passage John xii. 34, where the people say that "the Christ abideth for ever." But the Messianic explanation of Isa. liii. was admitted by all ancient Jewish theology. This incontestable fact excludes the supposition that the idea of a suffering Messiah was foreign to the general conviction, though the expectation of the glorious Messiah was naturally the dominant thought in the carnal mind of the people. Prophecy was full of contrasts of which it gave no solution; and the contradictory elements existed side by side in the national sentiment.

The forerunner, after describing the Messiah's work, points to the person of Jesus, in spite of its humble appearance, as corresponding to the contents of his declaration of the day before.

Ver. 30. "*This is He of whom*[1] *I said, After me cometh a man which preceded me; for He was before me.*" Not only does this saying apply to Jesus, now *present*, the testimony pronounced in His absence (vv. 26, 27), but it is also intended to resolve the enigma which it contained. The solution, which the forerunner now adds for the sake of the well-affected circle surrounding him, is contained in the words: *for He was before me.* The eternal pre-existence of the Messiah really explains His actual presence and action previously to the appearance of John within the bosom of the theocracy (see on ver. 15). The sense as well as the authority of the documents supports the Received reading περί (and not ὑπέρ). The word *ἀνήρ, this man*, is here suggested to John by the sight of the definite person whom he has before his eyes. Lücke and Meyer

[1] Instead of περί (*touching*), ℵ B C and Or. (twice) read ὑπερ (*in favour of*).

think that in ver. 30 the forerunner is referring not to the preceding testimony (vv. 26 and 27), but to some other previous saying, which is neither reported in our Gospel nor in the Synoptics. But is it conceivable that the evangelist, quoting two declarations, the one after the other, the second of which begins with the words: "*This is He of whom I said*" . . ., had no intention by this latter to recall the former? The error of those two commentators arises from the fact that at ver. 27 they admitted the incomplete reading of the Alex., which, by rejecting the words: *who was before me*, renders this declaration so different from that of ver. 30, that it cannot be the reproduction of the other, and all the more that the last words, added on the second occasion to explain the enigma, render the difference still greater.

In vv. 31–33 the Baptist relates the circumstances which authorize him thus to bear testimony to the redeeming mission and divine greatness of the man before him:

Ver. 31. "*And neither did I know Him: but that He should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water.*"[1] The word *κἀγώ, and neither I*, placed first and repeated as it is ver. 33, has necessarily a peculiar emphasis. It is related to ver. 26 ("*whom ye know not*"): "And neither did I know Him at that time (before His baptism)." It clearly follows from this that the words *οὐκ ᾔδειν, I knew Him not*, refer to the knowledge of Jesus *as the Messiah*. This meaning is likewise proved by the explanation which follows in this same verse, and which bears solely on the manner in which the Messiah was to be revealed. But, it will be asked, could John, the son of Zacharias and Elizabeth, be ignorant of the miraculous circumstances which had signalized his own birth and that of Jesus? And if he did not know them, how happens it that in Matthew's account, on seeing Jesus coming to him asking to be baptized, he answers: "*I have need to be baptized of Thee, and comest Thou to me*" (iii. 14)? Who else than the Messiah could the Baptist regard as holier than himself? The first question is generally answered by saying that the accounts given by John's relatives were not sufficient to give him a *divine* certainty, such as that on which his testimony needed to rest. This answer is well founded.

[1] B C G L P T♭ Δ Or. reject τῷ before ὕδατι.

But there is more: John the Baptist having lived in the deserts till the time of his showing to Israel (Luke i. 80), might, no doubt, have heard his parents relate the peculiar circumstances of his birth and the birth of Mary's son. But he did not know the latter personally. Otherwise, in virtue of those very accounts, he must have known Him also *as the Messiah*. And if he did not know Him *personally*, how much less could those accounts tell upon the idea which he formed of His Messianic dignity at the hour of His baptism? And such is the full sense of the words: *I knew Him not*. Thereby alone is the testimony given to Jesus by John raised above every suspicion of partiality or arbitrariness. But then how are we to explain John's answer to Jesus in Matthew: "*I have need to be baptized of Thee*"? Must we place it, according to the Gospel of the Hebrews, and as Lücke will have it, *after* the baptism, and that in opposition to our first Gospel? It has been thought, and not without ground, that at the moment when Jesus presents Himself to John, the view of one whose countenance sin had never tarnished arrested the forerunner, and drew from him the exclamation so strangely out of keeping with his mission. We think that we can answer the objection more satisfactorily. We have already observed that, according to Matt. iii. 6 and Mark i. 5, John's baptism was preceded by confession of sin on the part of the neophyte. A confession like that which the forerunner then heard from the mouth of Jesus might easily convince him that he had to do with one who hated and condemned sin, as he had never felt and condemned it himself. Thus is explained the exclamation of John, without the necessity of supposing any previous personal relation between him and Jesus.

The logical connection between the two propositions of the verse is easily established, when it is remembered that the revelation of the Messiah to Israel implied above all His manifestation to John himself, who was charged with the mission of proclaiming Him. The Synoptics assign to the ministry of the Baptist a more general object: to prepare the people for the kingdom of God by repentance; and here a contradiction has been alleged between them and our Gospel. But the latter also admits this general object; see ver. 23:

"*To make straight the way of the Lord.*" Only John is here concerned to set forth that which forms the culminating point of his ministry, the proclamation of the person of the Messiah. All his work rightly seems to him to be concentrated in this supreme act. The article τῷ before ὕδατι, erroneously rejected by the Alex., has a certain dramatic force: "If I have come baptizing with *that element* (pointing to the Jordan), it is only with the view of manifesting Him who is to baptize with a higher element." A whole scene was therefore supposed between the two propositions of ver. 31, that of the revelation of the Messiah to John himself. This blank is filled up by the following verses:

Ver. 32. "*And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like*[1] *a dove, and it abode*[2] *upon Him.*" This declaration is introduced with special solemnity by the words: *And John bare record.* For it is here, as Hengstenberg says, that we find the *punctum saliens* of the whole ministry of John the Baptist, his Messianic testimony strictly so called. With what sense did John see? With the eye of the body, or with the inner sense? This is to ask whether the fact mentioned here passed only in the spiritual world or also in the external world. In Mark's account (i. 10, 11) it is evidently Jesus who, at the moment when He goes up from the water, sees the heavens open and the Spirit descend on Him; the same in Matthew (iii. 16, 17), whatever may be said by the majority of commentators. In Luke the narrative is completely objective: "*It came to pass . . . that the heaven was opened*" . . . (iii. 21, 22). He, moreover, remarks that the event happened in answer to the prayer of Jesus. But the Baptist is not excluded by the Synoptics from participating in the vision which John ascribes to him. Matthew's account indirectly associates him in it by the form of the divine declaration: "*This is* my Son" (not as in Mark and Luke: "*Thou art* my Son" . . .). Besides, none of the four Gospels associates any other witness with this scene. If, then, the fact transpired in the sensible world, we must hold that Jesus and John were alone at that moment, which is not improbable,

[1] Instead of ὡσεί, which is read by T. R. with 8 Mjj., ℵ A B C and 8 Mjj. read ὡς.

[2] ℵ reads μεῖνον instead of ἔμεινεν.

as they were in the wilderness. However this may be, the fact related xii. 29 proves that an external phenomenon, even if others were present, would have produced in them only a vague wonder, and would not have had in their minds the signification which it might have for Jesus and for John himself (comp. also Acts ix. 7 and xxii. 9). As to the inward communication, it was addressed simultaneously to Jesus and to John, as is shown by the two forms of the divine address: *Thou art,* and *This is;* and the *objective* reality of the communication is definitely guaranteed by the circumstance that it was perceived at one and the same time by the two witnesses. In the following way we may conceive of the relation between the perception of Jesus and that of John: the divine communication strictly so called (the address of the Father and the communication of the Spirit) passed between God and Jesus; the latter had knowledge of the fact not only from the impression He received of it, but also from a vision which rendered it sensible to Him. John shared in this symbolical revelation of the spiritual fact. The voice, which sounded in the ear of Jesus in the form: "*Thou art* my Son," was heard by him in the form: "*This is* my Son." Neander denies that a symbolical vision could find place in the life of Jesus. But this rule is not applicable before the time of the baptism.

Here, then, we must distinguish two things: 1st, The real fact, which consisted in a new gift bestowed on Jesus, and which the narrative indicates in the words: *the Spirit descending and abiding on Him;* and 2d, The symbolical representation of the fact, intended for the consciousness of Christ Himself and for that of John, who was to bear witness of it: *the heavens opened, the form of a dove.* The divine address belongs at once to the fact itself and its sensible representation.

Heaven, as we behold it with the bodily eye, is the emblem of a state perfect in holiness, knowledge, power, and happiness. Consequently it is in Scripture the symbol of the place where God manifests His perfections in all their brightness, where His glory shines fully, and whence all supernatural forces and divine revelations come down. From the azure of the skies, which is rent, John sees descending a luminous form

like a *dove*, alighting and abiding on Jesus. This symbol of the Holy Spirit cannot be explained by any analogy borrowed from the Old Testament. In the Syrian religions the dove was the image of the force of nature which broods over all beings. But this analogy is too remote to explain our passage. Matt. x. 16, where Jesus says: "*Be ye harmless as doves*," has no direct connection with the Holy Spirit. We find some passages in the Jewish doctors where the Spirit who *moved on the face of the waters* (Gen. i. 3) is associated with the Spirit of the Messiah, and compared to a dove brooding over its young without touching them (see Lücke, p. 426). This comparison, so familiar to the Jewish mind, probably explains to us the form of the divine revelation. The emblem admirably suited the decisive moment of the baptism of Jesus. In reality, the matter in question was nothing less than a new creation, the consummation of the first. Humanity was passing at that moment from the sphere of natural life into that of spiritual life, with a view to which it had been created at the first. The creating Spirit, who had, with His vivifying power, brooded over chaos to bring out of it a world full of order and harmony, was proceeding, as by a new incubation, to transform the first humanity into the kingdom of heaven. But what we have, above all, to remark here is the *organic* form which the luminous apparition takes. An organism is an indivisible whole. At Pentecost the Spirit descends in the form of "*cloven tongues*" (*διαμεριζόμεναι γλῶσσαι*), which are divided among the faithful. Here is the symbol of the manner in which the Holy Spirit dwells in the church, *dividing to every man severally as He will* (1 Cor. xii. 11). But at the baptism of Jesus the fact is wholly different, and the emblem is also different. The Spirit descends upon Christ in His fulness. "*God*," it is said, iii. 34, "*giveth Him not the Spirit by measure.*" Comp. Isa. xi. 1, 2, where the seven forms of the Spirit, enumerated in order to designate His fulness, come to rest on the Messiah. Finally, we have to remark the word *abide*, which is an exact allusion to the word מנח in this passage of Isaiah (xi. 2). The prophets received occasional inspirations: *the hand of the Lord was upon them.* Then, retiring, the Spirit left them to themselves. So it was also with John the Baptist. But Jesus

shall not receive merely the visits of the Spirit; He is the dwelling-place of the Spirit in humanity, and the source from which He shall flow; hence the idea of *abiding* is put in close connection with that of *baptizing with the Holy Spirit* (ver. 33). The reading ὡσεί, more strongly even than ὡς, emphasizes the purely symbolical character of the luminous appearance. The μένον of the Sinait. is a correction occasioned by the preceding καταβαῖνον. The proposition is broken off designedly, in order to isolate and exhibit more clearly the idea of *abiding*. The construction of the acc. ἐπ' αὐτόν with the verb of rest ἔμεινεν, is dictated by the living character of the relation, as at vv. 1 and 18. Though the meaning of those symbols was evident, the Baptist feels the need of putting their signification on a yet surer ground than his own interpretation.

Ver. 33. "*And neither did I know Him: but He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on Him, the same is He which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.*" John wishes completely to banish the idea, that with his testimony he is mingling anything of his own. Not only had a sign been announced to him (ver. 31), and he had seen a sign (ver. 32), but that sign was exactly the one which had been announced. Everything like human caprice is therefore excluded from the interpretation of the sign which he gives. The repetition of the words: *And neither did I know Him*, is thus explained quite naturally. The expression ὁ πέμψας, *He that sent me*, has in it something solemn and mysterious; it evidently means God Himself, who spoke to him in the wilderness, and gave him his commission. That commission embraced—1st, The command to baptize; 2d, The promise that the Messiah should be revealed in connection therewith; 3d, The mention of the sign by which he should recognise Him; 4th, The command to point Him out to Israel. The resumption of the subject by the pronoun ἐκεῖνος, *He*, with the forcible sense which it has in John, "that one Himself, and no other," is intended to exhibit Jehovah as the being from whom everything proceeds in this testimony. The words ἐφ' ὃν ἄν indicate the most unlimited possibility: "The individual, whoever he may be, on whom." The act of baptizing with

the Holy Spirit is named as the essential character of the Messiah. He can do that for which John could only prepare: the one, by the baptism of water, awakes repentance and the desire of holiness; the other, by the gift of the Holy Spirit, satisfies this desire, the most elevated within the human soul.

Vv. 32 and 33 force on us the question, "Did Jesus really *receive* anything at His baptism?" Meyer says, No, holding that this idea has no support in our gospel, and that if the Synoptics say more, it is because they contain an already altered tradition: "The real fact was solely the vision received by John the Baptist; and this vision was transformed into the event related by the Synoptics." In this view, the idea of the communication of the Spirit would be incompatible with that of the incarnation of the Logos. Lücke and de Wette think that a permanent historical fact, the development of Jesus under the influence of the Holy Spirit, was revealed to John in the passing form of the vision. According, then, to those interpreters also, Jesus received nothing at that time. John was merely made aware of the constant communion of Jesus with the Holy Spirit, in order to bear witness to it. Neander, Tholuck, Ebrard, recognise in this fact a step of progress wrought in the consciousness which Jesus had of Himself. Others—B.-Crusius, Kahnis, Luthardt, Gess—allege a real communication, but only with a view to the task which Jesus had henceforth to discharge. He received the Spirit not for Himself certainly, but for the accomplishing of His ministry, and that He might communicate to men this heavenly gift. Meyer's view as well as Lücke's is contrary not only to the narrative of the Synoptics, which is sacrificed purely and simply to a dogmatic prejudice, but also to John's. For the vision of the Baptist, if it comes from God, must correspond to something. Now John saw the Spirit not only *abiding*, but *descending*, and the one feature must have as much reality as the other. Neander's opinion is true, but defective. There was certainly effected at that time a decisive progress in the consciousness of Jesus. This is indicated by the fact of the divine address: *Thou art my Son.* But, moreover, the fact of the *descent* of the Spirit must correspond to a real gift. Finally, the opinion which admits an actual

gift, but solely in relation to the public activity of Jesus which is about to begin, is superficial. In a life so thoroughly *one* as that of Jesus was, where nothing is purely ritual, where the external is always the manifestation of the inward, the beginning of a new activity supposes a change in the inner life. If Jesus has only from the date of His baptism the power of communicating the Holy Spirit, it is because He possesses the Spirit Himself from that time quite otherwise than He possessed it formerly.

If we seize the idea of the incarnation with the same force as we see it understood and presented by Paul and John (see ver. 14 and the appendix to the prologue), it will suffice to overthrow those explanations which result from an orthodoxy more rational than biblical. If the Logos despoiled Himself of His divine state, and consented to become the subject of a truly human development,—that is to say, of the normal development originally destined for man,—the time must come for Him when, after having accomplished the task of the first Adam in the way of free obedience and love, He would see opening before Him the higher sphere of spiritual or supernatural life; and when, first of the violent who take the kingdom of heaven by violence, He would force the entrance to it for Himself and for all. Undoubtedly His whole existence had flowed past under the constant influence of the Holy Spirit who had presided over His birth. At every instant He had responded freely to the call of this divine guide, and this hourly docility had been immediately recompensed by a new spiritual impulse. The vessel was filled in proportion as it enlarged, and enlarged in proportion as it was filled. But to be under the influence of the Spirit is not to possess the Spirit (xiv. 17). With the hour of His baptism the moment came when His preceding development must pass into the ultimate state, that of His *perfect stature* (Eph. iv. 13). "*First that which is psychical,*" says Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 46, "*and afterwards that which is spiritual.*" That law must apply, if the incarnation is a reality, to the development of Jesus, even as to that of any other man. Till then the Spirit was *upon* Him (ἐπ' αὐτό [τὸ παιδίον], Luke ii. 40); He grew under that divine influence in wisdom and grace. From His baptism onwards the Spirit becomes the principle of His psychical and

physical activity, His personal life; He can be called Himself *the Lord—the Spirit* (2 Cor. iii. 17, 18); *quickening Spirit* (1 Cor. xv. 45).

The baptism thus constitutes a crisis in His inner life as decisive as the ascension in His outward state. The *heaven opened* represents His initiation into the knowledge of God, and His designs. The voice, *Thou art my Son*, indicates the revelation to His inmost consciousness of His personal relation to God, of His eternal dignity as Son, and thereby of the boundlessness of the divine love toward Him, and toward mankind on whom such a gift is bestowed. He comprehends fully the name Father as applied to God, and can proclaim it to the world. The Holy Spirit, now become his personal life, makes Him the principle and source of life to all men. Nevertheless, His glorification is not yet; natural life, both of the soul and body, still exists in Him as such. Only after His ascension will His soul and body be completely spiritualized (*σῶμα πνευματικόν*, 1 Cor. xv. 44).

But, it will be asked, does not the gift of the Holy Spirit repeat the work of the miraculous birth? By no means; for, in the latter case, the Holy Spirit acts only as the life-giving force in the stead and place of the paternal principle. He awakes to the activity of life the germ of a human existence deposited in the womb of Mary, and prepares for the Logos, deprived of His divine state, the instrument in which he is to realize His earthly development; in the same way as on the day of creation the human soul, the breath of God the Creator, came to inhabit the body previously prepared by God from the dust of the earth (Gen. ii. 7).

Several modern theologians, in imitation of some Fathers, think that the Logos, or the Christ, is confounded with the Spirit by John. But every one will acknowledge as certain the truth of the remark made by Lücke: "No more could it be said, on the one hand, 'The Spirit was made flesh,' than it could be said on the other, 'I saw the Logos descend on Jesus.'" The distinction, which is scrupulously respected by John even in chap. xiv.–xvi., where M. Reuss regards it as sometimes wholly effaced (*Hist. de la Chrét.* t. ii. p. 533 et seq.), is this: The Logos is the principle of objective revelation, and, after the incarnation, that revelation itself; while the

Spirit is the inner principle by which we assimilate the revelation. Hence it happens that, without the Spirit, revelation remains a dead letter to us, and Jesus a historical personage with whom we do not enter into communion. It is by the Spirit alone that we appropriate the revelation contained in the word and person of Jesus. And so, from the time that the Spirit performs His work in us, it is Jesus Himself who begins to live within us. As, through the Spirit, Jesus when on earth lived by the Father, so through the Spirit the believer lives by Jesus (vi. 57). This distinction of functions between Christ and the Spirit is firmly maintained throughout our whole gospel.[1] This solemn testimony given, the forerunner expresses the feeling of comfort with which the fulfilment of his great task inspires him.

Ver. 34. "*And I (myself), I have seen, and have borne record, that this is the Son of God.*"[2] The two perfects, *I have seen* and *I have borne record*, indicate facts accomplished once for all and remaining. The divine herald has done his work; it is for the people now to do theirs—to believe. The ὅτι, *that*, depends undoubtedly on both verbs. John in reality *beheld* in the baptism scene the divinity of Jesus. The term *Son of God* characterizes a being as representing the Deity in a peculiar function. It is applied in the Old Testament to angels, judges, kings, and finally, to the Messiah: "*Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten Thee*" (Ps. ii. 7, 12); which does not at all mean that the mode of representation is identical in every case. An ambassador represents his sovereign, but certainly otherwise than the son of the latter, who in the case of this Sovereign represents His Father. Ver. 30 proves that the Baptist is here taking the word son in the highest sense which can be attached to it. As to his hearers, the term could only produce in them a vague impression of mysterious greatness and divine majesty. The words, *and I myself*, express very energetically the gravity of the testimony borne by the very man whom God had called to this mission.

[1] Hilgenfeld, identifying the descent of the Holy Spirit at the baptism with the coming of the Eon Logos into the man Jesus (according to the Valentinians), finds here a trace of Gnosticism. This idea has not the slightest support in the text.

[2] Instead of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ℵ reads ὁ ἐκλεκτὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. It is the only document which has this obviously untenable reading.

III. *Third Testimony.*—Vv. 35–37.

Vv. 35, 36. "*Again, the next day after, John stood, and two of his disciples; and looking upon Jesus as He walked, he saith, Behold the Lamb of God!*" Holy impressions, great thoughts, and an indescribable expectation, doubtless still filled, on the following day, the hearts of those who had heard the words of the forerunner. On the morrow, John was at his post, ready to continue his ministry as the Baptist. There is nothing to warrant de Wette's supposition, that the two disciples who stood with him had not been present at the scene of the preceding day. Far from favouring this idea, the brevity of the following testimony gives it the character of a reference to that of the day before. The expression ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν, *of his disciples*, implies that he had a considerable number of them. Of those two disciples, the one was Andrew (ver. 40); it is difficult to think that the other was not the author of the account. All the little details which follow have a special value only for him to whom they recalled the most decisive and happy hour of his life. That his person is kept anonymous, while all the other disciples are named, confirms this conclusion (Introd. p. 256 et seq.). There is a certain difference, in the relation of Jesus to John, between this day and the day before. Then, He came *to John* as to the person who was to introduce Him to future believers. Now, the testimony is borne; He has nothing more to receive from His forerunner than the souls whom His Father has prepared for Him; and, like the magnet which is passed through the sand to attract metal filings, He confines Himself to approaching the group surrounding the Baptist, to decide the *coming to Him* of some of those who compose it. The conduct of Jesus is thus perfectly intelligible, and regulated on God's plan. The church is not torn, she is gathered from the tree of the theocracy.

As Jesus enters into the plan of God, the Baptist enters into the thought of Jesus. A tender and respectful scruple might keep the two disciples beside their old master. The Baptist himself frees them from this bond, and begins to realize the saying which from that moment becomes his motto: "*He must increase, but I must decrease.*" The term ἐμβλέψας indi-

cates a penetrating look, which searches its object to the very depths (see ver. 42). The practical meaning of John's new declaration was evidently this: "Go to Him." Otherwise, to what purpose this repetition, which adds nothing to the testimony of the day before, but, on the contrary, abridges it? Only the invitation is expressed in the indirect form of an affirmation regarding the person of Jesus; because, as Luthardt says, attachment to Jesus was to be in them a matter of liberty and personal impression, and not of obedience to their former master.

Ver. 37. "*And the two disciples heard him speak,*[1] *and they followed Jesus.*" The saying of John took the form of an exclamation rather than of a direct address to the disciples; but they understood it. It is very evident that, to the evangelist's mind, the words, "*and they followed Jesus,*" conceal under their literal sense a profoundly symbolical meaning. This first step in the following of Jesus decided their entire life; the apparently accidental bond which was that hour formed was in reality an eternal bond.

We have yet to examine three questions which have been raised by criticism in regard to those testimonies of the forerunner.

I. Baur and Keim[2] allege that the narrative of the fourth Gospel is so planned as to exclude, by its silence, the fact of the baptism of Jesus by John; and that because it would have been contrary to the dignity of the Logos to receive the Holy Spirit. Hilgenfeld frankly acknowledges the opposite (*Einl.* pp. 702 and 719): "The baptism of Jesus," he says, "is *assumed*, not related. . . . It is not related, but mentioned as an accomplished fact, in the Baptist's second testimony, ver. 31 et seq." It is *assumed* in reality by vv. 32 and 33, for the meaning of the divine sayings quoted in them is to this effect: "Among the Israelites who shall present themselves for thy baptism, one will appear on whom, *while baptizing Him,* thou shalt see the Spirit descend. He it is . . ." Holtzmann has recognised the inevitable bearing of this passage.[3] But the fact is not *related,* it is true. Why? We have given the reason: because the starting-point of the narrative is posterior to this event. But if the forerunner, in the testimonies quoted by John, declares only what is *personal* to him in the baptism scene, it is not because the evangelist wishes

[1] ℵ and B place αυτου before λαλουντος.

[2] Keim (i. p. 520): "The fourth Gospel wholly ignores a baptism of Jesus by John."

[3] *Zeitschr.* of Hilgenfeld, 1872, p. 156 et seq.

thereby to deny the truth of the synoptical accounts; it is because the one concern of the Baptist here was to *authenticate* the so important theocratic act, which he was carrying through in bearing Messianic testimony to Jesus. With this intention he had nothing else to mention than what he had *seen himself*. The correlation of the two κἀγώ, *and I*, vv. 31 and 33, with that of ver. 34, clearly reveals this intention. As to the theory of the Logos in our Gospel, if it had the import ascribed to it by Baur and Keim, it would exclude from the history of Jesus many other facts which are, nevertheless, related at full length by our evangelist.

II. It has been thought inconceivable, that after such a sign and such declarations the Baptist could have addressed this question to Jesus from the depths of his prison: "*Art thou He that should come, or do we look for another?*" (Matt. xi. 3.) Strauss has drawn from this apparent contradiction an argument for denying the baptism scene. It is of course impossible to allow the view of some Fathers, who think that the forerunner only wished to strengthen the faith of his disciples by eliciting from Jesus the positive declaration of His Messianic character. The terms of the synoptical narrative will not bear this meaning. With more reason, one might allege, as Meyer does, the depression into which the sufferings of the prison had brought the forerunner; or say, with Lücke, that John could not understand the patient and humble course of the work of Jesus; and finally add, with Bäumlein, that besides the prophet there was yet in John the natural man, and that to the day of the former there might succeed the day of the latter. We may give, and, with Beyschlag and Keim himself, we ought to give, weight to the expressions of Jesus relative to John, which prove that there had been really in him at a given time a lively faith in Jesus, followed by a relapse more or less serious,—a relapse precisely characterized by the saying of Jesus: *to be offended in me* (Matt. xi. 6). Yet, with all that, we feel that at bottom a difficulty remains; unless, with Keim, we so reduce what took place between John and Jesus at the Jordan, that it amounts to almost nothing at all. Let us seek to find a more satisfactory solution. And — 1st, Let us recognise that John's faith in the divine mission of Jesus, even when he addressed Him with this question, remained intact. What proves this is that it is *He* whom he asks. His superior dignity to his own, and the reality of His mission, are not even then a matter of doubt with John. 2d, Let us remember what we said (ver. 31) of the dubiety which characterized the prevalent opinion relatively to the *prophet* like unto Moses, who should precede the Messiah, according to Deut. xviii. 18. Some identified him with the Messiah Himself (comp. John vi. 14, 15: "This is of a truth that prophet . . . They would come and take Him to *make Him a King*"); others distinguished those two personages, regarding the latter only as the Christ properly so called, *the King* in the political sense. These no doubt ascribed the *spiritual* side of the national restoration to the first, and the realization of the great *political* programme to the second. John, proceeding originally on the first view, which from vi. 14, 15 seems

to have been the most widely spread, had ascribed both offices to Jesus. But, while watching from the depths of his prison the slow and modest progress of the Messianic work as He was conducting it (*τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, the works of the Christ*, Matt. xi. 2), he began to question whether the second interpretation of the prophecy was not the true one, and whether the two functions were not distinct,—the one, that of the spiritual Messiah, bringing pardon and the gift of the Holy Spirit to Israel, and accompanying this holy activity only with unobtrusive miracles; the other, that of the political Messiah, establishing on this religious and moral foundation, once laid, the external kingdom, the Israelitish monarchy, and that by manifest judgments and acts of power of an entirely different nature. Jesus would thus not have ceased to possess in the eyes of John the Messianic dignity, the sign of which he had beheld at His baptism. The only question with him would be, whether Jesus was the only one, or whether after Him there would come a second, charged with the other part of the work. This is precisely what is expressed by the form of the question in Matthew: "Do we wait (not *for another*, *ἄλλον*, but for) *a second*, *ἕτερον*?"—an expression which implicitly recognises the Messianic character belonging to Jesus.[1] 3d, This distinction of the two Messianic functions, mistaken by John, was not a wholly false solution. Does it not correspond substantially to the difference between the Lord's first and second advent? To the one belong salvation and the sending of the Spirit; to the other, judgment and the kingdom. The Jewish literati were led, like John, by the apparently contradictory prophecies of the Old Testament, to a distinction analogous to that which presented itself to the mind of the prisoner of Machærus. Buxtorf (*Lexicon Chaldaic*, p. 1273) and Eisenmenger (*Entdeckt. Judenth.* p. 744 et seq.) quote a number of rabbinical passages distinguishing two messiahs, the one called the *son of Joseph*, or Ephraim, "to whom they ascribe the predicted humiliations of the Messiah;" the other, whom they name the *son of David*, "to whom they refer the prophecies of glory." The former will make war, and perish,—to him belong sufferings; the latter will raise him up, and shall live eternally. "Those who shall escape the

[1] The expectation of a great prophet, who is not expressly designated as the Messiah, may be established from the writing, entitled the *Assumption of Moses*, composed in the years following the death of Herod the Great (comp. Wieseler, *Stud. u. Kritiken*, 1868, and Schürer, *Lehrbuch*, etc., p. 540). In this work, which contains the most faithful picture of the spiritual state of the Jewish people at the very date of the birth of Jesus, there is announced (c. 14, trans. Latin, published by Ceriani) the coming of a *supreme messenger*, *nuntius in summo constitutus*, whose *hands shall be filled*, to work out the people's deliverance. Moses himself receives only the name of *great messenger*, *magnus nuntius* (c. 18). This envoy will therefore be the final prophet, a Moses raised to the highest power. No other royal and Messianic title is ascribed to him. And it is even probable that the author, who was a zealot, did not admit a personal Messiah, and rather expected a kingdom of God which should be organized as a democracy (Schürer, p. 571).

sword of the former, shall fall under that of the latter." "The one shall not bear envy against the other, *juxta fidem nostram*," says Jarchi finally (*ad Jes.* xi. 13). These last words attest the high antiquity of this idea.

III. M. Renan (*Vie de Jésus*, p. 108 et seq.) draws a fancy sketch of the relation between "those two young enthusiasts, full of the same hopes and hates, who could make common cause and mutually support one another." Jesus arrives from Galilee with "a small school already formed,"—where did the writer find any such thing either in John or the Synoptics? it is historical divination;—John gives a full welcome to "this swarm of young Galileans," though they do not attach themselves to him, and form a separate group round Jesus. "There are not many examples, it is true," remarks M. Renan himself, "of the head of a school eagerly welcoming the person who is to succeed"—or rather supplant him. But "is not youth capable of any self-sacrifice?"—No; the manner in which the Baptist, at the moment when his star is most brightly in the ascendant, retires all at once, to leave the field open to one younger than he, and till then wholly obscure, is not to be explained by the natural generosity of youth. Conscious of his divine mission, John could not retire except before the divine revelation of a higher mission. The Baptist's conduct in relation to Jesus, as attested by our four evangelists, remains, to the historian who does not here recognise the work of God, an insoluble problem. Before closing, a word more on a fancy of Keim's. This critic alleges (i. p. 525) that, contrary to the Synoptic narrative (comp. especially Luke iii. 21), our Gospel makes Jesus *the first* of all who appear at the baptism of John.[1] He forgets to quote his proof. We have established that John i. 19–28 assumes the priority of the baptism of Jesus and of the Baptist's ministry in the Synoptics. But *sic volo, sic jubeo!*

SECOND SECTION.

I. 38–51.—BEGINNINGS OF THE WORK OF JESUS.—BIRTH OF FAITH.

The testimony related in the first section was the condition of faith. We now see the birth of faith itself. It was in the outset the acceptance of divine testimony. But testimony is only a provisional bond between the believer and the object of faith. Faith only becomes living in the heart by direct contact with its object. That this contact may be effected, Jesus must manifest Himself to it; and then, from being

[1] "Das vierte Evangelium kehrt die Dinge um, und lässt Jesum zuerst auf der Stelle sein."

living, it immediately becomes fruitful. The believer in his turn bears witness, and thus becomes the link of union between new hearts and Jesus. Such is the significance of the following narratives. They fall into two groups: the first, embracing what refers to the three earliest disciples, Andrew, John, and Peter (vv. 38–42); the second, what relates to Philip and Nathanael (vv. 43–51).

I. *First Group.*—Vv. 38–42.

We have just named John. Almost all the adversaries of the authenticity of our Gospel themselves own that the author, in writing as he does here, wishes to pass himself off as an apostle. Even Hilgenfeld says: "Andrew and an anonymous person, who is assuredly John."

Ver. 38. "*Then*[1] *Jesus turned, and saw them following, and saith unto them, What seek ye? They said unto Him, Rabbi (which is to say, being interpreted, Master), where dwellest Thou?*" Jesus, hearing steps behind Him, turns round. He sees the two youths following, with the desire of accosting Him, but without venturing to take the first word. He anticipates them: "*What seek ye?*" This question, like so many other concise and profound sayings of Jesus contained in this piece, has a meaning beyond its immediate sense. He who puts the question knows that the seeking of Israel and the sighs of humanity tend to Him. The disciples, by replying: "*Master, where dwellest Thou?*" modestly express their desire of speaking with Him in private. The title *Rabbi* is undoubtedly much inferior to that which the testimony of John revealed to them as His due. But for the moment they would not dare to use another. And this title expresses, further, in a delicate way their intention to offer themselves as His disciples. The translation of the name, added by the evangelist, proves that the author writes for Greek readers.

Ver. 39. "*He saith unto them, Come and see.*[2] *They came and saw where He dwelt, and abode with Him that day: it was about the tenth hour.*" The disciples asked Him where His

[1] 6 Mjj. and 30 Mnn. reject δέ.

[2] T. R. reads ἴδετε, with ℵ A and 13 other Mjj., almost all the Mnn. It. Vg. Cop.; while B C L, some Mnn. Syr. and Or. read ὄψεσθε.

abode was, that they might visit Him there; Jesus invites them to follow Him at once (ἔρχεσθε, imper. pres.): "Come *now*." The reading of the Vaticanus: "Come and *ye shall see*," is unnatural. There is no ground for resting so much on the idea of seeing. Where did Jesus dwell? In some grotto on the bank of the Jordan, or in a caravansary, or in a friend's house? We cannot tell. As little do we know what was the subject of their conversation. But we know its result. The exclamation of Andrew, given ver. 41, is the enthusiastic expression of the effect produced on the two disciples. When we consider what the Messiah was in the mind of a Jew, we understand how profound must have been the impression received, to lead them without hesitation to proclaim this poor and unpretending man to be the Messiah. In the remark: "*and abode with Him that day*," there is expressed all the sweetness of that memory which was still living in the heart of the evangelist at the time when he wrote. The *tenth hour* may be understood in two ways: either as four o'clock in the afternoon, if we reckon the hours here as they were generally reckoned among the ancients, beginning with six o'clock in the morning,—we shall see that this is the most natural interpretation of the passages iv. 6, 52, and even xix. 14; or as ten in the morning, if we reckon according to the practice of the Roman Forum, which has passed to modern nations, starting from midnight. Rettig and Ebrard have attempted to apply this mode of reckoning to John's Gospel. If, at the first glance, the second explanation better accounts for the words, *that day;* on the other hand, this expression is harmonized with the former by the contrast which it forms with the idea of a simple visit, such as the two young men had proposed to make to Jesus. Instead thereof, the conversation was prolonged to the end of the day.[1] This notice has sometimes been applied

[1] To the kindness of M. André Cherbuliez we owe the following notices: Ælius Aristides, a Greek Sophist of the second century, a contemporary of Polycarp, whom he may have met in the streets of Smyrna, relates in his *Sacred Discourses* (book 5), that on his arrival in the city he had a dream during the night, in which the sun, rising over the public square, ordered him to hold that same day a declamatory *séance* in the common hall at *four* o'clock. This hour could only be, according to the manner of the ancients, ten o'clock in the morning, the hour which Xenophon calls that of the πληθουσα ἀγορά, in which the whole population frequents the public square. So he found the hall quite filled. In the

to the time when they *left* Jesus, not to that when they entered His abode. But in this case John would certainly have added ὅτε ἀπῆλθον, *when they went away*. It is the hour at which he *found*, not that at which he *left*, that the author meant to indicate. Faith is no sooner born of testimony, than it propagates itself by the same means.

Vv. 40, 41. "*One of the two which heard John speak, and followed him, was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother. He first*[1] *findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him, We have found the Messias* (*which is, being interpreted, Christ*)." The author at this point of the narrative names his companion Andrew. He designates him at the same time as Simon Peter's brother. It might be thought that he does so simply with a view to the calling of Peter, which is about to be related; but comp. vi. 8, where the same thing is repeated, and where it is impossible to allege a motive of this kind. The fact is remarkable. For Simon Peter has not yet figured in the narrative. Peter is therefore treated from the first as the most important personage. Let it also be remarked, that this mode of designating Andrew supposes the Gospel history to be already known to his readers. Did Peter's visit to Jesus take place the same evening? The affirmative follows almost necessarily, from the exact enumeration of the days in this piece. See *the next day*, vv. 29, 35, 43, and also ii. 1. The two disciples left Jesus for some moments, and Peter, brought by Andrew, might find Him yet before night.

How are we to explain the expressions "*first*" and "*his own* brother"? These words have always presented a difficulty to commentators. In reality, they contain a slight mystery, like others in which the narrative of John, at once so subtle and simple, abounds. It is ordinarily supposed that the two

first book, God having commanded him to take a bath, he chose the *sixth* hour as the most favourable to health. Now it was winter, and it was a cold bath which was in question. The hour was therefore *mid-day*. What leaves no room for doubt on this head is, that he says to his friend Bassus, who keeps him waiting: "Seest thou the shadow is already turning?" The custom of the Greeks of Asia Minor at this period is therefore well established by those instances. Langen has alleged a passage of the *Acts* of Polycarp's martyrdom (c. 7). But this passage appears to us insufficient to prove the opposite of the fact, which comes out so clearly from the words of the Greek rhetorician.

[1] Instead of the Received reading πρωτος, A B M T[b] Π, some Mnn. Syr. read πρωτον.

disciples went in search of Simon each his own way, and that it was Andrew who succeeded first in finding him. But the adj. *τὸν ἴδιον* ("*his own* brother") would in this case be only a periphrasis for the possessive pron. *his* (Lücke, de Wette, Bäumlein). He was first in finding, because he knew better the habits of *his* own brother. This explanation is far from natural. The relation of the two epithets is explained more simply, and the delicacy of the expression appears still better, if we hold that the two disciples set themselves to seek *each his own* brother—that is, the one Peter, the other James. Of the two, Andrew was the first who succeeded in finding *his*. From this sense it follows that James had come with John, even as Peter with Andrew, to the baptism of the forerunner. James is not named, as John himself is not, and as we shall find that their mother, Salome, is not (xix. 25). This delicate touch in the narrative, which reveals the endeavour of the anonymous disciple to find his brother also, is an inimitable evidence of his identity with the author of the Gospel. The reading *πρῶτος* is fully justified by this interpretation. The *πρῶτον* is either an awkward correction, or a mistake arising from the *τόν* which follows. The term *Messiah* (from משׁח, *to anoint*) was very popular; it was used even in Samaria (iv. 25). The translation *Χριστός* again supposes Greek readers. John had twice employed the Greek term *Χριστός* directly (vv. 20–25); but here he reproduces the Hebrew title, as he had done at ver. 38, and as we shall find him doing again, iv. 25, to preserve the dramatic character of his narrative.

Ver. 42. "*And*[1] *he brought him to Jesus. Jesus looked on him, and said, Thou art Simon the son of Jona:*[2] *thou shalt be called Cephas, which is, by interpretation, a stone.*" The pres. *he findeth*, and *he saith* (ver. 41), were descriptive; the Aor. *he brought*, expresses the rapidity with which this act followed the finding. The look signified by *ἐμβλέπειν*, denotes that penetrating glance which reaches to the very source of the individuality. This word explains the following apostrophe. Jesus has penetrated to Simon's natural character, and discovered in it the elements of the future Peter. We need not

[1] ℵ B L reject *και* before *ηγαγεν*.

[2] ℵ B L It$^{\text{aliq}}$ Cop. read *Ιωαννου* instead of *Ιωνα*, which is read in all the other Mjj. and in almost all the vss.

suppose that Jesus knew the names of Simon and his father *miraculously.* Andrew, on presenting his brother, must have named him to Jesus. Instead of *Jona,* we should probably read *John;* the Received reading is undoubtedly a correction taken from Matt. xvi. 17, where the word *'Ιωνᾶ* can only be an abbreviation of *'Ιωάννου.* A change of name generally characterizes a change of life or position. Gen. xvii. 5: "*Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram* (*exalted father*), *but Abraham* (*father of a multitude*)." Gen. xxxii. 28: "*Thy name shall be called no more Jacob* (*supplanter*), *but Israel* (*conqueror of God,* in lawful combat)." The Aramaic word cepha, כיפא (Hebrew, כף), signifies *rock.* By this name Jesus characterizes Simon as one strong and decided enough to be the support of the new world which He is about to create. There was assuredly, in the physiognomy of this young fisherman, accustomed as he was to brave the dangers of his profession, an expression of masculine energy and power of origination. By bestowing on him a new name, Jesus takes possession of him, and consecrates him, with all his natural qualities, to the work which He will confide to him.

Baur regards this passage as a fiction borrowed from Matt. xvi. 18, and placed here to exhibit in Jesus the omniscience of the Logos. But the ἐμβλέψας, *having beheld him* (*fixedly*), is not in keeping with such an intention; and as to the saying: "*Thou art Peter,*" Matt. xvi., it proceeds on the very supposition of a preceding one, in which Jesus conferred on him this surname. Each time Jesus starts from what is, to announce what is to be; here: *thou art Simon,* thou shalt be Peter; in Matthew: thou art Peter, thou shalt be what the name denotes. Proceeding on the fact that Peter is here mentioned third, Hilgenfeld, acting the part of prosecutor, argues for the conviction on which he is bent, saying: "Peter is thus deprived by John of the position of the first called!" And thus he finds a proof of the evangelist's ill-will to this apostle. As if the very designation given to Andrew (ver. 40), his eagerness to seek Simon, and the noble surname given to the latter, without any such honour being bestowed on the two others, did not at once make Simon the principal personage after Jesus! Comp. besides, vi. 68 and xxi. 15–19.

A contradiction has been alleged between this account and

that of the calling of the same disciples in Galilee, following on the miraculous draught (Matt. iv. 18–22; Mark i. 16–20; Luke v. 1–11). De Wette, Brückner, and even Meyer, regard reconciliation as wholly impossible; they decide for the narrative of the fourth Gospel. According to Baur, on the contrary, it is our account which is a fictitious composition. Lücke thinks that the two narratives may be harmonized. John's, referring to the calling of the disciples to *faith;* that of the Synoptics, to their vocation as *preachers* of the gospel, according to the saying: "*I will make you fishers of men.*" The first opinion seems to us to be untenable. If the two accounts narrated the same fact, altered in the Synoptics, how should everything be so completely different in the two scenes? The place: here, Judea; there, Galilee. The time: here, the first days of the ministry of Jesus; there, a later period. The persons: in the Synoptics there is no mention either of Philip or Nathanael; on the other hand, James, who is not named here, is expressly mentioned there. The situation: here, a purely simple meeting; there, a fishing. Finally, the mode: here, a spontaneous attachment; there, an imperative call. If the two accounts refer to the same event, Baur's opinion is in reality the more natural. The only difficulty is to explain how the author of the fourth Gospel, in face of the synoptical tradition received throughout all the church, could attempt of all things to create a new history of the calling of the principal apostles! Lücke's opinion is therefore the only admissible one. It is in itself perfectly probable. After having returned to Galilee (ver. 44), we know that Jesus went back for a time to the bosom of His own family, which transferred its domicile to Capernaum (Matt. iv. 13; John ii. 12; comp. Mark iii. 31). Why may He not have left His disciples also to return to the bosom of their families (Peter was married), to summon them at a later date to accompany Him in His ministry? The very readiness with which the young fishers follow His call in the Synoptics, forsaking at His first word their family and work to associate with Him, implies previous relations between Jesus and them. The synoptical account thus assumes that of John instead of excluding it. The narrative of the Synoptics having for its main subject the public ministry of Jesus, their writings could

not omit so important a fact as the calling of His oldest disciples to the ministry of preaching. The fourth Gospel, describing rather the development of apostolic faith, required, on the contrary, to put into relief the scene which we have just been studying; for it had been the point of departure in this development. The solution of most questions relating to the harmony of the Gospel writings, depends on the exact determination of the special aim of each of them.

II. *Second Group.*—Vv. 43–51.

The following account seems to be composed, by its conciseness, to baffle him who attempts to explain the events from an external point of view. Does ver. 43 express the *intention* only to set out for Galilee? Or does it indicate a real departure? Where and how did Jesus find Philip and Nathanael? Were they also in Judea among the disciples of John the Baptist? Or did He meet them on His arrival in Galilee? Evidently an account like this can proceed only from a man preoccupied above all with the spiritual element in the history which he relates, and who consequently merely sketches as slightly as possible the external side of events. Such is the general character of the narrative of the fourth Gospel.

Vv. 43 and 44. "*The day following He*[1] *would go forth into Galilee, and findeth Philip; and Jesus saith unto him, Follow me. Now Philip was of Bethsaida, the city of Andrew and Peter.*" The natural meaning of the Aor. ἠθέλησεν, *would (willed)*, is to denote a realized wish. The words: "*He would go, and He findeth,*" are therefore equivalent to: "*At the moment when* He *decided* to go, He findeth . . ." The simple juxtaposition of propositions is frequently found in John (Introd. p. 189). This mode of expression cannot be reconciled with the idea that Jesus did not meet Philip till later, on the way to or in Galilee. Philip was in the same quarter with Andrew, John, and Peter, and no doubt for the same reason. It was important for Jesus to surround Himself chiefly with men who had undergone the preparation got from the ministry and baptism of John. The notice of ver. 44 is

[1] T. R. here reads ὁ Ἰησοῦς with 5 Byz., and rejects it with four of them in the following proposition.

introduced here to indicate that it was through the instrumentality of the two brothers, Andrew and Peter, that Philip was brought into contact with Jesus. On the other hand, the term *He findeth,* is incompatible with the idea that they had positively brought him. At the time of starting, Jesus probably found him conversing with his two friends; on which he invited him to join Him along with them. The words: "*Follow me,*" therefore simply signify: "Accompany me on this journey." But Jesus knew well what would result from this bond once formed; and it is impossible to suppose that this invitation had not in His view a higher bearing. The verb *ἠθέλησεν,* denoting a deliberate resolution, leads us to ask what was the motive which decided Jesus to start for Galilee. Hengstenberg thinks that He wished to act in accordance with the prophecies, pointing to Galilee as the theatre of the Messianic ministry. This explanation would give an artificial air to the conduct of Jesus. According to others, He wished to keep His sphere of action apart from that of the Baptist; or, yet more, to remove from the seat of the hierarchy, which had just shown itself unfavourably disposed toward His forerunner. The subsequent narrative, ii. 12–22, leads to another solution. Jesus must inaugurate His Messianic ministry at Jerusalem. But for that He must await the solemn period of the feast of Passover. Previously, therefore, He resolved to repair to His family, and so close the first part of His earthly existence, the period of his private life.

Ver. 45. "*Philip findeth Nathanael, and saith unto him, We have found Him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth,*[1] *the son of Joseph.*" The part taken by Philip in the calling of Nathanael is like that of Andrew in the calling of Peter, and of Peter and Andrew in that of Philip. One lighted torch serves to light another; and thus faith is propagated. Luthardt finely points out the dull and complicated form of Philip's profession, those long considerations, that Messianic certificate in full form, which contrasts with the lively and unembarrassed style of Andrew's profession (ver. 41). The same characteristics reappear vi. 1–13, and perhaps also xii. 21, 22. From the fact that

[1] T. R. with E F G H K M U V Γ Λ Π: Ναζαρετ; ℵ A B L X: Ναζαρετ; Δ: Ναζαραθ; e: Ναζαρα (see my *Comm. on Gospel of Luke,* 2d ed. vol. i. pp. 88, 89).

Philip designates Jesus as the *son of Joseph* and a native of *Nazareth*, Strauss, de Wette, and others conclude that the fourth evangelist did not know or did not allow the miraculous origin of Jesus and His birth at Bethlehem: as if it were the evangelist and not Philip who was speaking here; and as if, after exchanging a dozen words with Jesus, Philip could have been in full possession of the most intimate circumstances of His birth and infancy! Andrew and Peter could not have informed him, for they were ignorant of them themselves. The place of Nathanael's calling is not indicated. The most probable supposition is, that Jesus and His disciples met him on the journey. Philip, who was his fellow-citizen, —Nathanael was a Galilean, of Cana (xxi. 2),—became the link of union between Jesus and him. Nathanael was perhaps returning home from the vicinity of John the Baptist; or he might be going, like all his devout fellow-countrymen, to be baptized by him. He had just been resting for some moments under the shade of a fig-tree, when he met Jesus and his companions (comp. ver. 48). There is no ground for Ewald's supposition, that the meeting took place at Cana. The very circumstantial account of Nathanael's calling leads to the belief that he was afterwards one of the apostles; this is the case with all the disciples mentioned in this passage. This appears further from xxi. 2, where the apostles are distinguished from simple disciples, and where Nathanael is placed among the former. As this name does not figure in the lists of the apostles (Matt. x. 3; Mark iii. 18; Luke vi. 14; Acts i. 13), it is generally held that Nathanael is no other than Bartholomew, whose name is joined with Philip's in almost all those catalogues. Bartholomew being only a patronymic (son of Tolmai or Ptolemy), there is no difficulty in this supposition. As to Späth's hypothesis, that Nathanael is a symbolical name (the word signifies *gift of God*), invented by the later author to designate the Apostle John, it is one of those fancies of modern criticism which does not even need to be refuted by its incompatibility with xxi. 2.

Ver. 46. "*And Nathanael said unto him, Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth? Philip saith unto him, Come and see.*" According to Meyer, Nathanael's answer alludes to the reputation for immorality which attached to the town of

Nazareth; according to Lücke and de Wette, to the smallness of the place. But there is no historical evidence that Nazareth was a place of worse fame, or less esteemed, than any other township of Galilee. Nathanael's answer requires no such suppositions. Is it not much better to connect this answer with the saying of Philip? Nathanael, not remembering any prophecy which assigns to Nazareth so important a part, is astonished; all the more because Cana is only a league distant from Nazareth, and because it is difficult for him to imagine this little neighbouring village raised all at once to so lofty a destiny. Every one knows the petty jealousies which frequently exist between village and village. The expression, *any good thing*, is evidently a litotes: "anything so eminent as such a personage." Here we observe for the first time a peculiarity in the narrative of John. It seems that the author takes pleasure in recalling certain objections to the Messianic dignity of Jesus, leaving them without any reply, because every reader acquainted with the Gospel history made short work of them at the moment; comp. vii. 27, 35, 42, etc. At the time when John wrote, every one knew that Jesus was not really of Nazareth. Philip's answer, "*Come and see*," is at once the simplest and profoundest apologetics. To every upright heart Jesus proves Himself by showing Himself. This rests on the truth expressed in ver. 9. Comp. iii. 21.

Ver. 47. "*Jesus saw*[1] *Nathanael coming to Him, and saith of him, Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!*" Nathanael is one of those upright men who have only to see Jesus to believe in Him; Philip knows it well. Jesus also, on seeing him, recognises and signalizes this quality in him. Searching him with His glance, as He searched Simon, He makes this reflection aloud *in regard to him* (περὶ αὐτοῦ): "Behold . . ." We may refer the adverb ἀληθῶς, *indeed*, either to ἴδε: "Behold *really*," or to Ἰσραηλίτης: "A man who is *truly an Israelite*." In the former case, the words, *in whom there is no guile*, would have no relation to the national Israelitish character, and would refer to Nathanael's personal character. In the second case, they would, on the contrary, define the notion of the true Israelite. This second sense is more natural, both grammatically and logically, and it corre-

[1] ℵ alone reads ἰδὼν . . . λέγει.

sponds better to the importance of the title *Israelite*, and to the original meaning of the name. The name of *Israel* (*conqueror of God*), as is known, was substituted for that of *Jacob* (*supplanter*), which indicates deceit and trickery, to characterize the triumph of righteousness in the patriarch in consequence of his wrestling with the Lord. The lawful struggle with God, by means of humiliation and prayer (Hos. xii. 4, 5), replaced the use of perverse means. The absence of guile is therefore the character of his true spiritual descendants.

Ver. 48. "*Nathanael saith unto Him, Whence knowest thou me? Jesus answered and said unto him, Before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig-tree, I saw thee.*" This reply, in which Nathanael seems to appropriate to himself such a eulogy, has been criticised as wanting in modesty. But he wishes simply to know on what ground Jesus judges him thus. If account is taken of the extraordinary effect produced on Nathanael by the answer of Jesus (ver. 49), it must contain in his view the proof of a supernatural knowledge which Jesus has of him. Lücke connects this knowledge solely with the inward state of Nathanael. Meyer, on the contrary, applies it only to the external fact of his sitting under the fig-tree. But if we are to understand the relation of this saying of Jesus, on the one hand to His previous declaration (ver. 47), on the other to Nathanael's exclamation (ver. 49), it is indispensable to conjoin both views. Not only does Nathanael recognise that he was seen by Jesus in a place where His natural sight could not reach, but he feels that this stranger's eye has penetrated him to his inmost depths, and that it is only in virtue of this penetration that He can give him the title with which He has just accosted him. If Nathanael was preparing to receive the baptism of repentance, serious thoughts must have filled his heart. What had passed in him at that period of self-concentration? Had he made the loyal confession of some sin to God (Ps. xxxii. 1, 2), or taken a holy resolution—made a vow, for example, to repair some wrong? However that may be, on hearing the word of Jesus, he feels himself penetrated by a look which must somehow participate in the omniscience of God Himself.

The words, *being under the fig-tree*, may refer grammatically either to what precedes: "before that Philip *called thee under*

the fig-tree," or to what follows: "*I saw thee under the fig-tree.*" The second is the more natural sense: the situation in which Jesus saw him is more important than that in which Philip called him. The construction of ὑπό, followed by the acc. (τὴν συκῆν), with the verb of rest, is explained by the fact that to the local relation there is joined the moral notion of taking refuge. *I saw,* denotes a view like that of Elisha (2 Kings v.). In Jesus, as in the prophets, there was a higher vision, which may be regarded as a partial association with the perfect vision of God. At this word Nathanael feels himself penetrated with a ray of divine light.

Ver. 49. "*Nathanael answered and saith unto Him,*[1] *Rabbi, Thou art the Son of God; Thou art the King of Israel.*" By the title *Son of God,* he expresses the transport which seized him on the discovery of this intimate relation between Jesus and God, of which he has just had experience. Lücke, Meyer, and most others, hold that this title is here the equivalent of Messiah. They think this proved by the following term: *the King of Israel.* But this is the very circumstance which excludes the alleged synonymy. If the two titles had the same meaning, the second would require at least to be joined to the former in the way of simple apposition, while the repetition of the pron. and verb σὺ εἶ, *Thou art,* before the second title, excludes this synonymy, which, besides, would only amount to an awkward tautology. And further, the title Messiah does not express with liveliness and freshness the immediate impression experienced by Nathanael. From its very nature it is the product of an act of reflection, and could only occur here second. To speak generally, we believe that this equivalency of the two terms, Son of God, and Messiah, has no existence, and that it is impossible to quote a single valid example of it. It is one of those numerous traditional fictions which should be summarily disposed of by a correct exegesis. The word *Son of God* expresses in the mouth of Nathanael the feelings, still very vague, it is true, but immediately resulting from what has just passed, of an exceptional relation between Jesus and God. But vague as this impression is, it is nevertheless rich and full, like everything which is matter of feeling, more even, perhaps, than if it were already

[1] B L reject καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ; ℵ reads καὶ εἶπεν.

reduced to a dogmatic formula. As Luthardt observes: "Nathanael's faith will never possess *more* than it embraces at this moment," the living person of Jesus. It will only be able to possess it more distinctly. The gold-seeker puts his hand on an ingot; when he has coined it, he has it better, but not more. The two titles complete one another: *Son of God* bears on the relation of Jesus to God; *King of Israel*, on His relation to the chosen people. The second title is the logical consequence of the first. The personage who lives in so intimate a relation to God, can only be, as is alleged, the *King of Israel*, the Messiah. This second title corresponds to that of *Israelite indeed*, with which Jesus had saluted Nathanael. The faithful subject has recognised and salutes his King. Jesus is conscious that He has just taken the first step in a new career, that of miraculous signs, of which His life till then had been completely destitute; and His answer breathes the most elevated feeling of the greatness of the occasion.

Ver. 50. "*Jesus answered and said unto him, Because I said unto thee that*[1] *I saw thee under the fig-tree, thou believest; thou shalt see*[2] *greater things than these.*" Since the time of Chrysostom, most commentators (Lücke, Meyer, etc.), editors, and translators (Tischendorf, Rilliet) give to the words, *Thou believest*, an interrogative sense. They put into this question either the tone of surprise (Meyer), because of a faith so quickly formed, or even that of rebuke (de Wette), as if Nathanael had believed before having sufficient proofs. The answer of Jesus has, however, more dignity when it is taken as an affirmation. Jesus recognises and approves the nascent faith of Nathanael; He congratulates him upon it; but He promises him a succession of miraculous manifestations rising in wonder, of which he and his fellow-disciples shall be witnesses, and which shall develop his new-born faith. This saying proves that from that day Nathanael remained with Jesus. Till now, Jesus had spoken to Nathanael alone: "*Thou believest; . . . thou shalt see.*" What He now declares concerns all present.

Ver. 51. "*And He saith unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto*

[1] ℵ A B G L, Syr., etc., read ὅτι before εἶδόν.

[2] T. R. reads ὄψει (Attic form). All the Mjj., with the exception of U Γ, read ὄψῃ.

you, From this time forward[1] *ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man.*" We meet for the first time with the formula, *Amen, amen,* which is found twenty-five times in John (Meyer), and nowhere else in the N. T. Thence is derived the title of Jesus, *The Amen* (Rev. iii. 14). This word (from אמן, *firmum fuit*) is, properly speaking, a verbal adjective, *firm, worthy of faith;* it is used as a substantive (Isa. lxv. 16): באלהי אמן, "by the God *of truth.*" It also becomes an adverb in a great number of O. T. passages, to signify, with a declaration: that remains sure; with a promise: let it be realized! This adverb is doubled, as in John, in the two following passages: Num. v. 22: "*Then the woman* (accused of adultery) *shall answer, Amen, amen;*" Neh. viii. 6: "*All the people answered, Amen, amen.*" This repetition implies a doubt to be overcome in the mind of the hearer. The supposed doubt arises sometimes, as here, from the greatness of the thing promised; sometimes from a prejudice which struggles against the truth asserted (for example, iii. 3, 5).

The omission of ἀπ' ἄρτι, *from this time,* though supported by three old Alex. Mjj.; is condemned by almost all moderns. So late as 1859, Tischendorf said: "*cur omissum sit, facile dictu; cur additum, vix dixeris.*" The Sinaïticus has led him to change his opinion (8th ed.). The word is decidedly authentic; witness its very difficulty. It was referred to real appearances of angels (so Chrysostom); now such facts are not mentioned till about the end of Jesus' life.—There is a close connection between the two ideas: heaven open, and the angels ascending and descending. By the abode of Jesus here below, the communication between heaven and earth is reopened, and the relation between the inhabitants of the two spheres recommences; for earth and heaven are no longer two, but one whole (Eph. i. 10; Col. i. 20). The second phrase proves that Jesus is thinking of Jacob's vision (Gen. xxviii. 12, 13). The ladder on which the angels ascend and descend represents, in Genesis, the protection of divine providence, and of its invisible agents vouchsafed to the patriarch. What is about to pass under the eyes of His

[1] ℵ B L, It. Cop. Or. omit ἀπ' ἄρτι, which is read by T. R., with all the other Mjj., the Mnn. Syr., etc.

disciples will be the highest realization of that vision. Jesus cannot understand by this the few appearances of angels which took place about the end of His life. Independently of the words, *from this time forward*, it is a continuous phenomenon which is in question. Most moderns, going to the opposite spiritualistic extreme, see here only the emblem of the heavenly character of our Lord's daily activity; as Lücke and Meyer say: "The symbol of living communion between God and the Messiah, in which the divine forces and revelations are concentrated." M. Reuss: "Angels are the divine perfections common to the two persons. . . . The literal interpretation would here be as poor as absurd." Luthardt (after Hofmann): "The personal (?) forces of the Divine Spirit." If the interpretation of the Fathers was too narrow, that of the moderns is too wide. There is not a single passage where the spiritual activity of Jesus is referred, even symbolically, to the ministry of angels. It is derived from the Spirit (ver. 32, iii. 34); or, more usually still, from the Father dwelling and acting in Jesus (vi. 57). Angels are the instruments of divine power in the domain of nature (see the angel *of the waters*, Rev. xvi. 5; *of the fire*, xiv. 18). This saying refers, therefore, to phenomena which, while passing in the domain of nature, are due to a causality superior to the laws of nature. Can Jesus characterize His miracles more clearly without naming them? It is also the only meaning which falls in with what has passed at that very moment between Nathanael and Him: "Thou believest because of this miracle of *omniscience;* it is only the prelude of more considerable signs." Jesus understands thereby those works of *power* of which the event following shall be the first example (*from this time forward*). This explanation is confirmed, besides, by the remarkable parallel, Matt. viii. 9, 10.—It is difficult to explain why the angels *ascending* are placed before those *descending*. Is it simply from a reminiscence of Genesis? There, undoubtedly, God would have Jacob to feel that the angels were already near him at the time when he was receiving this revelation of divine protection. According to Meyer and Lücke, Jesus would mean here also, that at the time when the *ye shall see* shall take place, this relation to heaven shall be in full activity. I rather think that the angels are here represented

by Jesus as an army grouped round their chief, the Son of man, who says to one, *Go*, and to another, *Do this*. Those servants then ascend to seek power from God; then they descend again to execute their commission.

Were not those two allusions, the one to the name of Israel (ver. 47), the other to Jacob's dream, suggested by the view of the very localities which Jesus was then passing? He was returning from Judea to Galilee, either by the valley of the Jordan, or by one of the two plateaus which it divided. Now, there it was that the places stood which were made famous by the life of the patriarch: *Bethel*, on the western plateau, the name of which was due to his mysterious dream, *Mahanaim* (the double camp of angels), and *the ford Jabbok*, on the eastern plateau, famous for an appearance of angels on the occasion of his return to Canaan, and on account of the mysterious struggle to which he owed the name of *Israel* (Gen. xxxii.). It is possible that as they passed those places, classical to every Israelitish heart, Jesus conversed with His disciples of the scenes which they recalled.

What is the meaning of the expression, *Son of man*, whereby Jesus here designates Himself to His disciples? We refer to the dissertation which follows for the examination of the general questions bearing on the origin and signification of the title. Here we have to do with it only in its relation to the context. Now it has obviously an intentional reference to the two names which Nathanael gave to Jesus, those of Son of God and King of Israel. Besides the double relation of Jesus to God and to the people of Israel, is there not in His life and person a third relation: one to the whole of humanity? It is this relation which is expressed by the third title. In adopting it as His habitual designation rather than the second, which had a very marked political and particularistic hue, Jesus wished from the first to establish His ministry on its true and wide basis already laid down by the word of His forerunner: "Which taketh away the *sin of the world*." His task was not, as Nathanael imagined, to found the Israelitish monarchy; it was to work out the salvation of humanity. He came not to finish the theocratic drama, but to consummate the history of the world.

This title formed, then, along with the others, a double

antithesis, by which it gave them completeness. It declared the relation of Jesus to *men*, as the first exhibited His exceptional relation to *God*, and the second His historical relation to the *people of Israel*. Those three relations do in reality exhaust the life and history of Jesus.

The Son of Man.

Jesus here begins to designate Himself by the name *Son of man*, and it is quite probable that this was really the first occasion on which He took the title. We find it thirty-nine times in the Synoptics (by connecting the parallels; most frequently in Matthew and Luke); ten times in John (i. 52, iii. 13, 14, v. 27 [without the article], vi. 27, 53, 62, viii. 28, xii. 23, 34, xiii. 31). Regarding its meaning and origin, very different opinions prevail among modern critics. These opinions may be arranged in two principal classes.

I. Some think that Jesus is here borrowing from the Old Testament a sort of technical title fitted to designate Him either as a *prophet*,—thus it would be an allusion to the name *Son of man*, which God uses in addressing Ezekiel,—or as the *Messiah*, in allusion to Dan. vii. 13: "And I saw one *like a son of man* coming on the clouds of heaven." This Messianic prophecy had become so popular in Israel, that the Messiah had received the name of *Anani*, ענני, the man of the clouds. It would thus be natural to suppose that Jesus chose the term as denoting in a popular way His Messianic function; all the more that there exists a saying of Jesus in which He has solemnly referred to this description of Daniel while appropriating it to Himself, Matt. xxvi. 64: "From this time ye shall see *the Son of man* sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." Of those two alleged allusions, the first is untenable; for it is not as a prophet that God calls Ezekiel son of man, but as a creature wholly powerless to do the divine work of which He is inviting him to become the agent—thus so far as he is *man*. Would it not be contrary to all logic to maintain that, because God in one case has called a prophet son of man, it follows that the name is the equivalent of the title prophet?[1]

The allusion to Daniel as the basis of this designation proper to Jesus, is admitted by almost all modern interpreters, Lücke, Bleek, Ewald, Hilgenfeld, Renan, Strauss, Meyer, etc. This is also, as it seems, the opinion of M. Wabnitz.

If the question were: Did Jesus, in thus designating Himself, associate in His mind this title, and the: *like a son of man* of Daniel? it would seem difficult to deny it, at least as to the occasion when

[1] Comp. the detailed refutation of this interpretation given by M. Vernes, and to a certain extent by Weizsäcker, in the article of M. Wabnitz, *Revue Théol.*, Oct. 1874, p. 165 et seq.

He proclaimed Himself the Messiah in answer to the high priest before the Sanhedrim. But that is not the question. The point is whether, in choosing this name as His own by predilection, Jesus meant: "I am the Messiah announced by Daniel," or whether it was a much more personal and profound feeling of what He was to humanity, which impelled Him to create the name spontaneously.

The following are the reasons which preclude us from regarding this title as a simple reproduction of Daniel's expression: 1st, What Jesus borrows from the Old Testament has in general only the character of accommodation. The idea itself, as well as its expression, springs up originally from His heart and mind; only to make way for it more easily to the hearts of His hearers, He readily connects it with some saying of Scripture. How can we believe that the chosen name which Jesus used habitually as His own was merely the product of slavish imitation? If anything must have found expression in the depths of His own consciousness, it is this name. 2d, Throughout the whole course of John's Gospel, Jesus carefully avoids, as we shall see, proclaiming Himself the Messiah, Χριστός, before the people; because He knows the political meaning commonly attached to the term, and that the least misunderstanding on this point would have been instantly fatal to His work. He uses circumlocutions of every kind to express His Messianic functions, but never the term itself. Comp. viii. 24, 25, x. 24, 25, etc. . . . And in direct contradiction to this procedure, we are to suppose that He chose a designation which had the technical meaning of Messiah in popular opinion! 3d, Two passages in John prove that the name Son of man was not generally applied to the Messiah: xii. 34, where the people ask Jesus what personage it is whom He designates by the name Son of man (see the exegesis); and v. 27, where Jesus says that the Father has committed all judgment to Him, because He is *Son of man*. Assuredly, if this expression had signified here the Messiah, the article *the* could not have been wanting. It was indispensable to designate *the* personage announced under this name. Without the article there is here a simple indication of *dignity*. God makes Him the judge of men because He is a member of the human race. Besides, let us not forget that in Daniel judgment is exercised, not as M. Renan wrongly says, by the Son of man, but by Jehovah Himself; and it is only after this act is wholly finished that there appears in the clouds the Son of man to whom dominion is given.[1] 4th, In the Synoptics also there are passages where the meaning Messiah does not suit the words Son of man. It is enough to quote Matt. xvi. 13, 15, where Jesus asks His disciples, "Whom say men that I the Son of man am? . . .

[1] It is true that in the Book of Enoch (c. 37–71) the Messiah is several times called the Son of man. But the passage is suspected of Christian interpolations (in *Herzog's Encycl.*, art. "Messie," by Oehler; Keim, *Gesch. Jesu*, ii. p. 69). In any case, were those pieces entirely authentic, the passages in John prove that the denomination was not yet current among the people.

And whom say ye that I am?" If this term had been equivalent to that of Messiah, would Holtzmann not be right in asking how Jesus, after having designated Himself a hundred times as the Son of man, could yet put this question to His disciples: "Whom do ye take me to be?" 5th, The appearance of the Son of man in Daniel's prophecy has an exclusively eschatological significance. The matter in question is the glorious establishment of the final kingdom. Now it is not easy to understand how, from such a representation, Jesus could have taken His personal name during the very period of His earthly abasement; while we can perfectly understand why this designation having been once adopted for other reasons, He made express allusion to it as it occurs in Daniel's prophecy, at the moment when, in presence of the Sanhedrim, He required to affirm His glorious return, and His dignity as the judge of His judges. Let us add, finally, that Daniel did not say, I saw a son of man, or the Son of man, but vaguely: *like* (the figure of) a son of man. Could Jesus from such an expression borrow the stereotyped name Son of man? 6th, If we are to believe the common exegesis, the term Son of God had the meaning of Messiah. If the term Son of man likewise signified Messiah, it would follow that Son of God signified Son of man, or inversely.[1] Now those two terms evidently express an antithesis and not an identity. They may and ought undoubtedly to be referred both to the person of the Messiah, but to designate it in two different aspects logically distinct and supplementary of each other.

II. These reflections lead us to the second class of interpretations, that which takes this title to be an expression emanating from the inner self-consciousness of Jesus, whether the feeling of His greatness or that of His abasement be regarded as ruling Him in this choice.

1. There is no need to refute the explanation of Paulus and Fritzsche: "The individual whom you see before you," *homo ille quem benè nostis.* Would Jesus have thus paraphrased more than fifty times the pronoun *I*?

2. De Wette and Tholuck see in this name which Jesus takes, the notion of the weakness of His earthly appearance. But who can believe that God gives over to Jesus all judgment because of the infirmity of His earthly appearance? v. 27.

3. Chrysostom, Grotius, and some moderns find in this name of Jesus a deliberate antithesis to His essential divine Sonship. Who else than a being strange to the human family could take for his *characteristic* name, the title, child of the race? This explanation is ingenious, but it does not correspond well to the simplicity of the feeling of Jesus.

Others incline to the side of the feeling of His glory, thus:

4. Keerl thinks that this title is applied to the Son of God, in so far as His essence is to be in God the *eternal man.* The Messiah

[1] To this identification, indeed, all the endeavours tend which Keim makes to attenuate the difference between those two terms, ii. p. 388.

differs from that eternal man only because He is clothed with terrestrial flesh and blood. But would not the term Son of man be wholly inappropriate to express such an idea? It would have required the first-born or archetype of humanity.

Gess [1] thinks that this expression designates Jesus as "the manifestation of divine majesty in the form of human life." He supports his view by the passages in which there are ascribed to the Son of man the divine functions of the pardon of sin (Matt. ix. 6), of judgment (Matt. xvi. 27, xxv. 31), of sovereignty over angels (Matt. xiii. 41), etc.,—functions which far surpass the capacities of human nature even when perfected. But what if perfected human nature in its very idea is nothing else than the participation of the creature in the divine perfections whose organ it is destined to become? In this case there is nothing in the functions enumerated which passes beyond the limits of true human nature. Besides, it seems to us impossible that the natural meaning of the expression Son of man should be to designate the divine majesty, even supposing it united to the human form. We might ask M. Gess how this explanation accords with his theory of the *kenosis*, according to which Jesus must have lived here below destitute of His divine glory.

Only one explanation appears to us to answer to all historical and exegetical demands, that which under various forms is found radically the same in Böhme, Neander, Ebrard, Olshausen, Beyschlag, Holtzmann, Wittichen, and Hofmann, and which we defended in the first edition of this work.

We have seen that in v. 27 the term Son of man denotes, in the mouth of Jesus Himself, His participation in human nature. And is not this what is naturally signified by the term *Son of man*, which does not denote either a son of *Adam*, or the son of His *Father*, but a true son of *humanity*, a representative of the race itself. Such is the meaning of the phrase in Ps. viii. 4: "What is *man*, that Thou art mindful of him? and the *son of man*, that Thou visitest him?" Such is its meaning in the divine address to Ezekiel. It is the same (Dan. vii. 13) where the human figure is the emblem of the divine kingdom, just as the wild beasts were the types of earthly power in its various pre-Messianic phases. This emblem of a son of man admirably expresses the profoundly *human* character of the kingdom of God. All those phrases arise from the same feeling which suggested to Jesus the designation of which we are speaking. Jesus wished above all, in adopting it, to emphasize His entire homogeneousness with us. He did not borrow a name ready-made, but He obeyed the instinct of His love for humanity, and the feeling of that indissoluble union with the race into which He had entered. It was the marked expression of the fact which John has declared when he says: "The Word was *made flesh*." But let us not forget that Jesus did not say: "a son of man," but "*the* Son of man." Thereby He proclaimed Himself not only *a*

[1] *Christi Zeugniss von seiner Person und seinem Werk*, 1870.

man, a *true* man, but *the* true man, the *normal* represent
human type. In the very act of affirming His *equality* w
thus declared His absolute *superiority* over all the other m
the human race. To designate Himself thus was certainly
His dignity as Messiah, but only in an implicit way. By
it He succeeded in expressing the idea while avoiding the o
term, the meaning of which was falsified. Without calling H
the Christ, He yet said to every man: "Behold me, and thou
see what thou shouldst have been, and what through me
mayest yet become." This substitution of the true *idea* o
Messiah for the *word* Messiah corresponded in two imp
respects to the inner feeling of Jesus: First, He succeeded th
in removing from His ministry everything like a political be
and in inaugurating the purest Messianic spirituality. In the se
place, He freed the notion of the kingdom of God from everything
like theocratic particularism. Jesus thus announced Himself as the
Representative and Head not merely of Israel, but of the whole of
humanity. This is what has led Böhme to say (*Versuch das Geheimniss des Menschensohns zuenthüllen*, 1839) that the object of Jesus in choosing this name was to *dejudaize* the idea of the Messiah.

We can see with what admirable prudence Jesus acted in the choice of this name, which was undoubtedly the fruit of His inner life. His love in this, as in everything, guided Him wondrously. Perhaps His spiritual tact was directed in its choice by the most ancient of all prophecies, that which was the germ whence grew the true Messianic revelations, and which has as its salient features, on the one hand the purest spirituality, on the other the widest universality: "The seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the serpent." In the phrase, Son of man, the word *man*, ἄνθρωπος, denotes not the individual, but the species, and refers equally to the two sexes; now the woman's part is to represent *human nature* as such. There is therefore no great interval between the term Son of man, and this: *the seed of the woman.* Jesus would thus describe Himself as the normal man, called consequently to accomplish the grand task of humanity, that of conquering the enemy of God and men.[1]

Is it the feeling of greatness which predominates over that of weakness, or the reverse? To this question, put by Keim, I answer, with Pascal: "If you abase man, I exalt him; if you exalt him, I abase him." Does not Ps. viii. say that man's greatness consists in his very meanness in which God. condescends to visit him; as his

[1] In the idea which we have above expounded, there converge, as it seems to us, all the explanations which belong to this class, and which we shall hastily enumerate. Baur: "A simple man, to whom belong all the miseries which can be affirmed of any man whatever." Schenkel: "The representative of the poor." Holtzmann: "He to whom may be applied, in the highest degree, whatever may be said of any other man;" or, "the indispensable organic centre of the kingdom of God in humanity." Wittichen: "The perfect realization of

in the glorious grace of this visitation? Those two human life, sublime in its lowliness, infinitely poor in its und in Jesus their complete realization, in His conscious- r perfectly distinct reflection; and He conjoined them bly in His title Son of man.

of man, with the mission to realize it in humanity." M. Colani: "The o is the Messiah, but who will not designate Himself expressly as such." ann: "The man in whom all the history of humanity must find its issue." ler: "He who realizes the idea of humanity." Böhme: "The universal h." We are surprised to find this explanation rejected off-hand by M. z in the following words: "It will be desirable also to discard from the iate historical sense of our title . . ., etc." (p. 170, note).

END OF VOL. I.

MURRAY AND GIBB, EDINBURGH,
PRINTERS TO HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018